

The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER 1912

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A POINT OF GREEK AND LATIN WORD-ORDER.

In discussing ambiguity of expression, the author of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* says (c. 25): δὲ καὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων μήτε συγκεχυμένην μήτε ὑπερβατὴν ποιεῖν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ συγκεχυμένον τοιόνδε ἐστίν, ὥς ὅταν εἴπῃς· δεινὸν ἐστὶ τοῦτον τοῦτον τύπτειν [τοῦτον semel AMP, τύπτειν τοῦτον CDEO]. ἄδηλον γὰρ ἦν, ὁπότερος ἦν ὁ τύπτων. εἰ δὲ εἴπῃς οὕτως, δῆλον ποιήσεις· δεινὸν ἐστὶ τοῦτον ὑπὸ τοῦτον τύπτεσθαι. The suggestion has not hitherto been made, but it seems possible that, in choosing his illustration, the writer was thinking of Aristophanes *Frogs* 610, where (context apart) τοῦτονί might be not subject but object:

εἴτ' οὐχὶ δεινὰ ταῦτα, τύπτειν τοῦτον ἑλέποντα πρὸς τὰλλότρια;

This coincidence perhaps deserves a passing notice. The correspondence may, however, be simply casual, for it must be admitted that the author of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* seems usually to coin examples, where Aristotle, in the *Rhetoric*, would quote them.

As to the parallel ambiguity in Latin and the best means of removing it, Quintilian is in agreement with the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* and uses a similar illustration. He says, 'accusativi geminatione facta amphibolia solvitur ablativo, ut illud, *Lachetem audivi percussisse Demean*, fiat, a *Lachete percussum Demean*' (*Inst. Or.* vii. 9). It is natural for a modern reader to imagine

that, in an ambiguous sentence of this sort, *Lachetem*, as coming earlier than *Demean*, would be presumed to be the subject. And probably it would be thus taken by the ordinary, ingenuous reader or hearer—by the *ιδιώτης*—in ancient times. But Quintilian and the author of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* have the law-courts in view, and legal drafting must afford no loophole to the evasive quibbler. Quintilian's ideal for the lawyer in relation to the man he wishes to convince is: 'quare non ut intellegere possit, sed ne omnino possit non intellegere curandum' (viii. 2, 24).

The same care is clearly needed in dealing with those who palter with us in a double sense. Neither Quintilian (vii. 9, 6), nor Cicero (*de Div.* ii. 56, 116), seems to doubt that the oracular response found in Ennius (*Ann.* vi. 5) is obviously ambiguous:

aio te Aeacida Romanos vincere posse.

Cicero remarks that its ambiguity would be patent even to a member of the house which Ennius styles 'stolidum genus Aeacidarum.' He does not, however, believe that it is a genuine oracle of Apollo: partly because it is not in Greek but in Latin. Valesius suggested, as a possible Greek original,

νικᾶν σ' Αἰακίδῃ Ῥωμαίους φημὶ δύνασθαι,

in which verse the first two words may perhaps be thought to sound more dis-

quieting than the first two words of the Latin line.

An instructive passage which shows how unsafe it would be, even where there is no deliberate trap, to regard the earlier of two accusatives as even presumptively the subject is to be found in Cicero himself (*Verr.* v. 8, 21): 'etiam illud praeteribo, quotienscumque Panhormum veneris illo anno et sex mensibus—nam tam diu fuit Apollonius in carcere—totiens te senatum Panhormitanum adisse supplicem, cum magistratibus sacerdotibusque publicis, orantem atque obsecrantem ut aliquando ille miser atque innocens calamitate illa liberaretur.' Cicero's reason for putting *senatum* (subject) after *te* (object) seemingly is the greater clearness thus gained in the reference of *supplicem* and *orantem atque obsecrantem*; and it is further not unlikely that the scornful collocation *totiens te* pleased the Ciceronian ear. In the delivery of the speech, some special intonation of the *te*, or a slight pause after it, would make the hearer alive to the true construction. Why, however, was not perfect clearness attained by inserting *ad* before *te*? The inferior manuscripts do, in fact, give *ad*; but Cicero probably intended by 'te adisse' to suggest the notion of 'approaching' a high official, whereas in the previous sentence ('adeundi ad illum miserum') the sense conveyed is that of 'visiting' a poor wretch in prison.

Priscian seems to see an instance of inverted order in 'aio te,' etc., if the *te* be taken as object. And modern Latin grammarians usually regard the earlier position in a sentence as the natural one for the subject. But the classical writers make the freest use, for rhetorical effects (such as emphasis, euphony, variety, etc.), of that departure from normal order which, in an inflected language, is usually possible without ambiguity. Consequently, when the inflexions fail to obviate an ambiguity, there is no *certainty* of order to fall back upon. If a Greek author were careless enough to write τὸ μειράκιον ἀπέκτεινε τὸ παιδάριον (instead of substituting a masculine noun or using the longer form ἀπέθανεν ὑπό), it would not be possible to determine

which of the two neuter nouns is subject and which is object. Herodotus, who is freer from rhetorical art than most Greek prose-writers, gives almost side by side the 'natural' and the 'unnatural' order: συνέβη τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρης ἐν τε τῇ Σικελίῃ Γέλωνα καὶ Θήρωνα νικᾶν Ἀμίλκην τὸν Καρχηδόνιον καὶ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι τοὺς Ἕλληνας τὸν Πέρσην (vii. 166), but ἐπεὶ δέ σφεας (object) παραλαμβάνειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας (subject: vii. 150).

The length to which the rhetorical freedom of Greek word-order could be pushed in prose and verse, for captious and jocular purposes, may be judged from Euthydemus' fallacy in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (ii. 24) or from lines 811, 812 of Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*. Certainly τούτων in *Frogs* 610 cannot be regarded either as object or as subject simply because it comes after the infinitive.¹ In *Frogs* 169, τότ' ἐμ' ἄγειν, one at least of the modern editors, influenced apparently by the word-order, takes ἐμέ to be the subject. But should we not then have expected φέρειν [sc. τὰ στρώματα]? In *Frogs* 1030 ταῦτα γὰρ ἄνδρας χρὴ ποιητὰς ἀσκεῖν, there can be no doubt that ἄνδρας ποιητὰς should be taken together (cp. ἄνδρα ποιητήν in 1008) as the subject. But, so far as mere grammar and word-order go, the meaning might be 'poets should train men in this way'; and other still more far-fetched interpretations might pass muster syntactically. A poet, or for that matter an ordinary prose-writer, can hardly be expected to attain the almost pedantic clearness demanded by the rhetorician and legal formalist: 'Illa quoque [vitanda est ambiguitas] quae, etiamsi turbare non potest sensum, in idem tamen verborum vitium incidit, ut si quis dicat, visum a se hominem librum scribentem. nam etiamsi librum ab homine scribi patet, male tamen composuerit feceritque ambiguum, quantum in ipso fuit' (Quintilian viii.

¹ For this freedom cp. Plat. *Gorg.* 456 D, οὐ τοῦτου ἕνεκα τοὺς φίλους (object) δεῖ τῶντων οὐδὲ κεντεῖν τε καὶ ἀποκτείνεσθαι, and 457 C, τὸν οὖν οὐκ ὀρθῶς χρώμενον (object) μισεῖν δίκαιον καὶ ἐκβάλλειν καὶ ἀποκτείνεσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν διδάξαντα. The rhetorical emphasis gained by placing the object early in these two sentences is obvious.

2). Sophocles, tried by such a test as this, would stand doubly or trebly condemned when he writes (*Ant.* 288):

ἢ τοὺς κακοὺς τιμῶντας εἰσορᾶς θεοὺς;

The ambiguity here is surely formal, not real; but formal ambiguity there undoubtedly is.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

HIPPOCENTAUR AND THE DOGS OF THE CYNEGETICUS.

C. 7 § 5. Ψυχή, Θυμός, Πόρπαξ, Στύραξ, Λογχή, Λόχος, Φρουρά, Φύλαξ, Τάξις, Ξίφων, Φόναξ, Φλέγων, Ἀλκή, Τεύχων, Τλεὺς, Μήδας, Πόρθων, Σπέρχων, Ὀργή, Βρέμων, Ὑβρις, Θάλλων, Ῥώμη, Ἀνθεύς, Ἡβα, Γηθεύς, Χαρά, Λεύσων, Λύγῳ, Πολύς, Βία, Στίχων, Σπουδή, Βρύας, Οἰνάς, Στερρός, Κραυγή, Καίνων, Τύρβας, Σθένων, Αἰθήρ, Ἀκτίς, Αἰχμή, Νόης, Γνώμη, Στίβων, Ὀρμή.

This is the list of the dogs according to the more reliable version. We are informed by Arrian (*Cyn.* c. 31) that Xenophon 'found' part of this miscellany and 'invented' part of it himself. Now, since Herodian (i. p. 30, ed. Lentz) writes Θάλλων ὄνομα κύριον κυνὸς παρὰ Ξενοφῶντι, it is evident that Θάλλων is to be reckoned among Xenophon's inventions. But Herodian mentions also Ξίφων, Λεύσων, and Σπέρχων as dogs' names (i. pp. 36, 37), and we may safely conclude that he took these too from Xenophon's list. Βρέμων (i. p. 32) and Στίβων are catalogued by him as proper nouns, but he does not say that they belonged to dogs. We can scarcely be wrong in attributing all the hypocoristics in -ων, -ωνος to Xenophon himself. Λεύσων has been corrupted by Dindorf into Λεύσων: cf. Herodian (ii. p. 818) λέυσετε Ἀρίσταρχος ἐν σγράφει· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐνεστῶτα αὐτὸ λέγω. Cf. apparent future forms like Παύσων, etc. Aristarchus, it seems, wrote the *present* forms of λεύσσω with one sigma, and this orthography is frequently found in MSS.; but Herodian held that λεύσω is correct only as a *future*.

According to Herodian, Λόγχη and Κραυγή were paroxytone when they were proper nouns. If so, the accents on several of these dogs' names are probably wrong in the MSS. The analogy of ἀργός and Ἄργος, moreover, suggests that Στέρρος should be read. This change is supported by Herodian

(I. p. 204), who says στερρός, πυρρός τὸ ἐπιθετον. Πύρρος δὲ τὸ κύριον, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ Ὑρρος καὶ Γέρρος; and again (I. p. 139) Γόργος τὸ κύριον, γοργός δὲ τὸ ἐπιθετον. Cf. also Apollonius in *Et. Mag.* 191, 21 (III. p. 47, ed. Schneider).

All the names in the list, with one exception, look suitable, or at least possible. Οἰνάς, indeed, excites some suspicion, for neither 'Rockdove' nor 'Vine' mixes well with the others. But may not its meaning be 'Madcap'? However that may be, the one clear blunder is Πολύς. It is impossible to suppose that Xenophon either 'found' or 'invented' such a name for a dog. For who can think that Πολύς was one of the standard dog names, like Aura, say, or Corax or Lycottas? On the other hand, can Xenophon, who, according to Pollux, called a dog of his own Ἴπποκένταυρος, have suggested out of his head (δεξιῶς ἀναγέγραφε, says the admiring Arrian) that you should call yours anything so fatuous as Πολύς? To be sure, I have sometimes mused on the practical difficulties involved in Ἴπποκένταυρος as the name of a sportsman's dog; and I have imagined that possibly Hippocentaur, if he belongs to the Skillus days, worked on Mount Pholoe with the boys, and was called Pholos, 'Centaur,' for short. Φόλος might do for the Πολύς in our list, since it follows from what I have said above that no objection can be taken on the score of the accent. The Italian editor has embraced Radermacher's suggestion Ποδῆς. Herodian recalls Ποδῆς only as ὁ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ, but in CIG 8139 he is a dog. He appears, in fact, in the Calydonian hunt along with Gorgos, Charon, Leukios, Thero and Podargos. But his accent is against his admission. Against him, too, is his very celebrity, for Xenophon's borrowings do not appear to include the names of any famous dogs: else Argos must surely

have been here. Against Φόλος it may fairly be urged that it is unlikely in this list just because it is the name of another kind of creature, though on the other side it must not be forgotten that Ἀνθεύς, one of the names in our list, is also a local name of Pan. On the whole, however, Weiske's Πόλος appears to me better. But is there not yet another and a stronger candidate to be found? Xenophon has made Τλεύς from ὕλη—that needed some δεξιότης—and he has coined Γηθεύς from γηθῶ. He shares, in fact, the notorious δεξιότης of Athenian authors in the field of etymology, especially in that branch of it that is concerned with proper names. Why should he not have made Πολεύς, 'Rover,' out of πολεῖν? He might similarly have given Σπιβεύς, but he preferred the hypocoristic Στίβων, just as he preferred the hypocoristic Φόναξ to Φονεύς.

E. C. MARCHANT.

P.S.—In c. v. 20 we read in A, *ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἀκούσαντες ἀλλὰ δόξαντες ἢ πεισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτά, παρὰ τὰ αὐτά, διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν, ἐπαλλάττοντες ἄλματα, ἐμποιοῦντες ἔχρουν ἔχρη ἀποχωροῦσι*. Something is clearly wrong with *ὑπ' αὐτά*, and *πεισθέντες* calls aloud for an infinitive. Surely *ὑπαντᾶν* is the right word. The hares 'are persuaded that the hounds

are after them.' The verb occurs as a hunting term in c. vi. 17. It seems to me equally clear that *ἐκάστης* should be altered to *ἐκάστην* in c. x. 7 *ὑπὲρ δὲ ἐκάστης (ἄρκυος) ἐμφράττειν τῇ ὕλῃ καὶ τὰ δύσορμα*. Mr. Richards proposes *περὶ* for *ὑπὲρ*; but the sense is 'beyond the net.' C. ii. opens with this amorphous jumble: *πρῶτον μὲν οὖν χρὴ ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ ἐπιτηδεύμα τὸ τῶν κυνηγεσιῶν τὸν ἥδη ἐκ παιδὸς ἀλλάττοντα, εἶτα δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐπιτηδεύματα, τὸν μὲν ἔχοντα σκεψάμενον τὴν οὐσίαν, ὃ μὲν ἱκανή, ἀξίως τῆς αὐτοῦ ὠφελείας, ὃ δὲ μὴ ἔστιν, ἀλλ' οὖν τὴν γε προθυμίαν παρεχέσθω*. Xenophon is not writing hunter's jargon here any more than in the epilogue. Radermacher has cut out from *εἶτα* to *ἐπιτηδεύματα* and so has made a better sentence. But surely it is not only *ὁ ἔχων* who is to 'look to his means.' It looks as if *τὸν μὲν ἔχοντα* is a corruption of *τὰ ὄντων ἔχοντα* (*ἐπιτηδεύματα*). Lastly, in c. i. § 7, A, the best MS., has the unmeaning reading *Νέστωρ δὲ παρελήλυθεν ὡς ἀφ' ἐνὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὰς ἀκοάς*. For *ἀφ' ἐνὸς* read *φρόνιμος*, comparing Isocrates *Panegyricus*, § 72, *Μεσσηνὴ μὲν γὰρ Νέστορα παρέσχε τὸν φρονιμώτατον ὑπάντων*. The condition of A (for which now see Ruehl *praef.* p. xi) fully justifies such a conjecture.

HERMES-NOUS AND PAN-LOGOS IN PINDAR, OL. II.

OF all the cryptic passages in Pindar, none has been more clearly marked as such by the author than *Olympian* ii. 91 ff.:

πολλά μοι ὑπ' ἀγκῶνος ὠκέα βέλη
ἐνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας
93 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν· ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν
ἐρμηνέων χατίζει.

Schol. (152 E) *ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος οὕτω· διὰ δὴλά (?) φησιν ὁ Πίνδαρος τοῖς συνετοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἶναι, εἰς δὲ τὸ κοινὸν ἀγόμενα ἐρμηνέως χρῆζειν*. Topán Boeckh; *ἐς δὲ μέσον* Oelschlaeger, *ἐς δ' ἄπορον* Schwickert. Topán was defended by Verrall (*Journ. of Philol.* xvii.) as derived from a conjectural *τοπή (τοπάειν).

The difficulty, of course, lies in the words *ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν*, the metre demanding

that *πᾶν* shall be scanned short. Christ's note (*Pind. Carm.*, 1896) is: *ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν, in vulgus; vocalem nominis πᾶν in adverbiali formula corripuit ex analogia nominum compositorum πᾶμπᾶν et σύμπᾶν*. Kühner-Blass (*Ausführl. Gram.* i. § 133) report the short form *πᾶν* as Aeolo-Doric, referring to Herod. i. 533, ii. 12. 903 and to this passage. It appears to be unparalleled in classical Greek. What I wish to suggest is that Pindar used this unexampled form here because he had a special reason for setting this phrase, *ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἐρμηνέων*, exactly where it stands: no other words and no other place would do. The reason is to be found in the words which fill the corresponding place in the antistrophe:

93 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσι· ἐς δὲ τὸ ΠΑΝ
ἙΡΜΗνέων

is tautometric with

101 αὐδάσσομαι ἐνόρκιον ΛΟΓΟΝ ἀλαθεῖ
ΝΟΩΙ.

Hermes and *Nous*, Pan and *Logos*—these are the expressions which will be φωνάεντα συνετοῖσι. Zielinski (*Arch. f. Religionswiss.* ix. p. 34) points out that Plato (*Kratylus* 408 D ἐστὶν ἤτοι Λόγος ἢ Λόγου ἀδελφὸς ὁ Πάν, εἴπερ Ἑρμοῦ υἱὸς ἐστὶν) takes it as given that Hermes is father of *Logos*; and this gives us the equation Pan = *Logos*, as a mystic doctrine probably to be referred to the old Arcadian Hermetic, from which Zielinski derives the Strassburg Cosmogony (Reitzenstein, *Zwei religionsgesch. Fragen*, Strassb. 1901). Hermes, as son and messenger of Zeus, was equated with *Logos* already in the sixth century by Theagenes of Rhegium (Diels *Frag. d. Vors.* ii. p. 511). Later mysticism developed the trinity: Νοῦς (= Zeus), Νοῦς δημιουργός (= Hermes), and Λόγος. If I am right, we have in the second Olympian one germ of this development: Hermes = *Nous*, Pan = *Logos*. It will be remembered that Pindar had at his doors a cult of the Great Mother and of Pan, who sang one of his pæans. The ancient Lives emphasise his connection with Pan. (See also my note on *Hermes*, *Pan*, *Logos*, *Classical Quarterly*, iii. p. 281.)

Though I think that the theory of tautometric responsions has sometimes been overdriven, no student of Pindar can doubt that they occur and often give the key to the interpretation of difficult passages. I have elsewhere (*From Religion to Philosophy*, London, 1912, p. 174⁴) pointed out another case in this ode:

19 Χρόνος ὁ πάντων πατήρ
85 πόσις ὁ πάντων Πέας (i.e. Kronos),

which gives us the Orphic equation Kronos = Chronos, again at least as old as the sixth century (Pherekydes, Diels *Frag. d. Vors.* ii. p. 507). The points which make me think that the present instance is not a mere coincidence are (1) that Pindar expressly warns us that he is writing cryptically; (2) that the form πᾶν needs some special justification; (3) that the phrase αὐδάσσομαι λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόφ is itself not an obvious expression, and has the air of being dragged in with a purpose.

Finally, the thought that *Nous* is the father of *Logos*—Wisdom the father of Speech—is peculiarly appropriate to the context, which continues:

σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ Φεῖδῶς φυᾷ·
μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι
παγγλωσσία, κόρακες ὥς, ἄκραντα γαρ-
ύετον
Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον.

Pindar is, of course, the σοφός, whose poetry comes of native wisdom: his *logos* is born of *Nous*. The noisy crows, whose knowledge is only learnt at second-hand, are not πᾶν-σοφοί but πάγ-γλωσσοί: their *logos* comes only from the tongue; it is mere chattering (τὸ λαλαγήσαι, l. 106), not fathered by the Mind. As Heracleitus says, πολυμαθὴ νόον οὐ διδάσκει. Bacchylides, a few years later (468 B.C.), openly takes up Pindar's challenge in Ode III. 85 φρονέοντι συνετὰ γαρύω—as much as to say: 'My words have meaning enough for one who really has the Mind you boast of'—; and claims to be, not a πάγ-γλωσσος κόραξ, but a μελί-γλωσσος ἀηδών (l. 96). If the cap fitted so well, Bacchylides and Simonides must be the pair of crows.

F. M. CORNFORD.

Cambridge.

NOTES AND EMENDATIONS.

THUCYDIDES V. 103, 1.

Ἐλπίς δὲ κινδύνῳ παραμύθιον οὔσα κ.τ.λ.

Editors have long felt that the sense required by the passage is 'an encourage-

ment to risk,' rather than 'a solace, a relief, to danger; danger's comforter,' but the dative has been a stumbling-block: hence some have fallen back upon κινδύνου of Dion Hal. and Sto-

baeus. But if we look at the first sense of κίνδυνος, we shall find this difficulty disappear. There are two lines in Theognis, 637-8 to which our passage almost appears to look back:

ἐλπίς καὶ κίνδυνος ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν
ὁμοιοί,
οὔτοι γὰρ χαλεποὶ δαίμονες ἀμφότεροι.

There translate: 'Hope and the Spirit of Adventure'; and write Κίνδυνος with a capital letter.

The whole chapter in Thucydides is highly poetical, even lyrical in its tone, and this use of Κίνδυνος appears to be Theognidean: cf. Theognis 557:

φράζο· Κίνδυνός τοι ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἵσταται
ἀκμήs,

and perhaps 585

πᾶσιν τοι κίνδυνος ἐπ' ἔργασιν, οὐδέ
τις οἶδεν
πῇ σχήσειν μέλλει, πρήγματος ἀρχο-
μένου.

The words indeed have a Theognidean, a poetical cadence, such as is sometimes found in Thucydides; for instance ἀνδρῶν ἐπιφανῶν πᾶσα γῇ τάφος and τὸ γὰρ φιλότιμον ἀγήρων.

So again in Pindar, *Pythian* iv. 125:

τίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας;
τίς δὲ κίνδυνος κρατεροῖς ἀδάμαντος δῆσεν
ἄλλοις;

the point is given exactly by the Scholiast:

ποία ἰσχυρὰ καὶ κινδυνώδης ἀναγκὴ
παρώρμησεν;

where ὥρμησε is correctly used of an inward impulse.

With this key, we can now approach the dative κινδύνῳ. Παραμυθεῖσθαι with the dative 'to stimulate, encourage' is found in the *Iliad* I. 417, Καὶ δ' ἂν τοῖς ἄλλοισιν ἐγὼ παραμυθησαίμην, I. 684, O. 45.

The substantive παραμύθιον, then, may have a dative after it, like Plato, *Euthyphro*, 17 C δόσις θεοῖς; *Rep.* 493 D διακονία πόλει. *Apol.* 30 A ὑπηρεσία with dative: Kühner, ii. 1, p. 427. An exact parallel is found in the use of παρακλεύομαι and παρακλήσεις: the verb takes a dative; and for παρακλήσεις followed by a dative see Plato, *Sympos.* 182 D:

ἡ παρακλήσεις τῷ ἐρῶντι παρὰ πάντων
θανμαστή.

The passage then should be written 'Ελπίς δὲ Κινδύνῳ παραμύθιον οὔσα, and translated 'Hope is an encouragement to the Spirit of Adventure.' Κίνδυνος will be another of the personified abstracts like Πενίη, Ἀμηχανίη, Πειθώ and Ἀναγκαίη in *Hdt.* viii. 111, Εὐλάβεια *Eur. Phoen.* 782, Ἐλπίς *Iph. Aul.* 392, and *Theognis* 1135: all called θεοί.

THUCYDIDES VI. 78, 3:

καὶ εἰ γνώμῃ ἀμάρτοι, τοῖς αὐτοῦ κακοῖς
ὀλοφυρθεῖς κ.τ.λ. So edd.

Editors have not decided whether ὀλοφυρθεῖς is used here in a passive or a middle sense. But it seems clear that ὀλοφυρθεῖς cannot be twisted into meaning 'commiserated for.' But if it is middle, 'lamenting for,' it would require an accusative: the reference in LS to Plato, *Rep.* 329 A for a dative is misleading, for there is no dative there. The Scholiast has ἐπὶ ταῖς ἰδίαις συμφοραῖς ὀλοφυρόμενος, where again the meaning is uncertain. It is true that Thucydides elsewhere vii. 30, ii. 46 (ἀπολοφ-), viii. 81 (ἀνολ-) uses ὀλοφυράμην, not ὀλοφύρην, in the middle sense; but he also uses the two forms of the aorist of μέμφομαι in the middle sense (see Veitch s.v. ὀλοφύρομαι), ἐμεμφάμην in iii. 61, ii. 64, and ἐμέμφην in iv. 85, 1. May we not conjecture here εἰ γνώμῃ ἀμάρτοι, <ἐπὶ> τοῖς αὐτοῦ κακοῖς ὀλοφυρθεῖς, 'lamenting over?' The preposition would give a lawful construction.

SOPHOCLES, *Oedipus Rex*, 1492-1495:

ἄλλ' ἤνικ' ἂν δὴ πρὸς γάμων ἦκη
ἄκμάs,
τίς οὗτος ἔσται, τίς παραρρίψει, τέκνα,
τοιαῦτ' ὀνειδὴ λαμβάνων, ἃ ταῖς ἐμαῖς
γοναῖσιν ἔσται σφῶν θ' ὁμοῦ δηλήματα.

So Jebb, for MSS. τοῖς ἐμοῖς γονεῦσιν, which yields no tolerable sense. 'Such reproaches as must be disastrous alike to my offspring and to yours,' is his version. But the sense required by the situation itself, as well as by the context is rather 'et proli suae et sibi exitiosa mox futura,' and this can be obtained by

ἃ ταῖσιν αἰs
γοναῖσιν ἔσται σφῖν θ' ὁμοῦ δηλήματα.

There seems no valid reason for questioning the use of *σφιν* as a dative singular. The passages in which it occurs have been discussed by Jebb on *Oedipus Coloneus*, 1489, where *σφιν* is used clearly referring to *ἄρ' ἐγγὺς ἀνὴρ*; in l. 1486. The enclitic in the caesura need cause little hesitation. Dr. Headlam, in the *Classical Review* iv. 355, gives the following instances:

Aesch., <i>Eumen.</i>	462	with <i>νιν</i> .
" <i>Suppl.</i>	760	" <i>τις</i> .
" <i>Pers.</i>	348	" <i>τις</i> .
" <i>Sept.</i>	689	" <i>πῶς</i> .
" <i>Agam.</i>	1123	" <i>τῷ</i> .
" <i>Suppl.</i>	399	" <i>πέρ</i> .
Soph., <i>Phil.</i>	741	" <i>τῷ</i> .
" <i>Phil.</i>	824	" <i>τις</i> .
" <i>Aj.</i>	829	" <i>τοῦ</i> .
" <i>Phil.</i>	446	" <i>πῶ</i> .
" <i>O.C.</i>	972	" <i>πῶ</i> .
" <i>O.C.</i>	896	" <i>πέρ</i> .
Eur., <i>Alc.</i>	181	" <i>τις</i> .
" <i>El.</i>	892	" <i>τῷ</i> .

The phrase in 1486 *καὶ σφὼ δακρύω* and 1488 *οἶον βιώναι σφὼ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων χρεῶν* immediately before,

and the general tenor of the speech, which ends in 1511 with

σφῶν δ', ὦ τέκν', εἰ μὲν εἰχέτην ἦδη φρένας,
πολλ' ἂν παρήνουν,

may well have caused the mistake *σφῶν* in this line. In another place in this play the memory of the general context seems to have led the scribe astray:

906-7 *φθίνοντα γὰρ Λαῖου <παλαίφατα>*
θέσφατ' ἐξαίρουσιν ἦδη

though the addition *παλαίφατα* is not certain, Mekler's conjecture *Δαλίου* 'the Delian God' is much more appropriate to the context than *Λαίου*. *Ταῖσιν αἷς* is Sophoclean: Prof. Housman, I find, has restored the possessive relative pronoun with his *τοῖσιν οἷς γόνιοισιν*, which is adopted by Prof. Tyrrell in his text: but *γοναῖσιν*, as Kennedy argued, and as the Index shows, is more Sophoclean than *γόνιοισιν*.

J. U. POWELL.

Oxford.

LUCANEA.

MR. SMALE'S notes in *Classical Review*, Vol. XXV., No. 7 (November, 1911), suggest some remarks:

Bk. IV. 618.

colla diu grauibus frustra tentata lacertis
immutumque caput fixa cum fronte tenetur:

Mr. Smale finds it difficult to refer the lines to the action of each wrestler. 'The heads of both could not be "gripped tight with brow immovable."' So he takes 618 as representing the attitude of Hercules, 619 that of Antaeus.

But is *tenetur* 'gripped tight'? Does the line not mean, 'each holds his head stiff without yielding to the other's pressure on his neck and with the face muscles tense'? If Antaeus is in the position Mr. Smale's 'vivid picture' denotes, could Lucan continue (620) *miranturque habuisse parem*? Antaeus would have other thoughts, and the phrase *fixa cum fronte* of a wrestler being 'screwed,' even if possible for

Lucan's defective sense of humour, has less force than as ordinarily interpreted. Again, the rest of the narrative is quite inconsistent with the position Mr. Smale has in view. Cf. l. 624, etc., *tum cervix lassata quati, tum pectore pectus urgueri*. . . . If Mr. Smale is right, we would expect a change of attitude from the application of the 'screw' to be clearly indicated. Both lines should be taken of either wrestler, neither of whom so far—Hercules is reserving himself (620)—has gained any advantage. *Colla* is a poetical plural, not 'the necks of the two' but 'the neck of each.' Francken rightly keeps *tenetur* (*V*¹ has *tenentur*), but his explanation '*oratio post lacertis continuatur et tenetur pertinet ad utrumque subiectum*' seems less simple than to supply *sunt* with *tentata*. See, however, Oudendorp on l. 422.

¹ I follow Hosius' designation of the MSS.

Bk. V. 107.

saepe dedit sedem totas mutantibus urbes
ut Tyriis.

A well-known crux. The MSS. variations are (1) *sedes* C and R (the Regius primus, where it is corrected to *sedem*) (2) *notas* V, according to Steinhart. *Motas* had been suggested already by Ussani. Mr. Smale conjectures *motas tutantibus*. This seems hardly possible: it makes *dedit sedem* otiose, and again—though not a point to be pressed—who are the other people, 'ut Tyriis,' who suffered earthquake and consulted Apollo?

Can we accept the reading—*totas*—of the MSS. (apparently one cannot be certain of V) as retained by Hosius (despite Mr. Smale) and Mr. Heitland? (1) Mr. Smale objects that *totas* is 'dull' and also 'inaccurate, as the Tyrians did not change their whole city but merely sent out colonies.' *Totas* may be dull, but it is not the critic's business, fortunately, to lend Lucan animation, and the poet's inaccuracy is well known. (Will even Prof. Housman's brilliant *Albim* 1. 481 stand?) (2) The real difficulty lies in the phrase *totas urbes mutare*. *Urbem mutare*, as Francken points out, means *migrare a loco*; cf. Luc. 2, 137, Hor. *Ep.* 1. 2. 27, etc. If the MSS. are right, *totas* can only mean, as Mr. Heitland has shown *C. J.* IX. 195 a, *prorsus*. None of the examples he cites from Lucan in its defence are quite parallel, but they are sufficiently close to suggest the authenticity of the reading. Francken reads *sedem tutam*, etc., derived from *tutamutantibus*, which is neat. R. Samse (*Interpretationes Lucanae*, 1905, p. 52) boldly takes *totas urbes* with *dedit* and *sedem* with *mutantibus*, but the instances he quotes in support of this construction are not convincing. On the whole Mr. Heitland's interpretation seems the best. Lucan refers surely not to the earthquakes at Tyre (Diodorus Siculus xxv. 2), as Weise followed by Haskins believes, but to the stories of Cadmus and Dido, as the scholiasts explain.

Bk. V. l. 287.

'nil actum est bellis si nondum comperit istas
omnia posse manus.

All editors and MSS . . . read as above.' Mr. Smale makes all the recent editors commit a mistake of orthography which they do not. And Guyet conjectured *ista*, which is read by Francken. *Manus* is then, of course, subject in the sense 'troops' and *se* is omitted. No change however seems necessary. The MSS. are unanimous, and Mr. Smale's objections have no weight: (1) *iste* is frequently used not in reference to the second person, see the examples Francken quotes from Lucan himself *ad loc.* (2) The subject is not *miles qui bella gerit* (Mr. Smale misquotes Haskins), which would hardly be possible, but *Caesar*. The troops appeal for discharge with threats of assassination. 'From his experience of our fighting Caesar surely knows these hands of ours stop at nothing.' The third person is used similarly, alternating with the second in ll. 289-290, 293. I find the scholiasts explain in the same way (cf. Endt and Usener *ad loc.*)

Bk. V. l. 663.

iussa plebe tuli fasces per bella negatos.

Iubere in the meaning 'appoint' is common; cf. Liv. 1. 22. 1 'Tullum Hostilium regem populus iussit.' But whether the passive *iussa* here can mean 'he bade them elect him' seems very questionable. Nor does L. seem to have had in mind the formula *velitis iubeatis* with which the magistrates invited the people to confirm proposals brought before them. Francken objects to *iussa* as inconsistent with Caesar's treatment of the comitia. From a

scholium in V, 'negatos m per bella a plebe iussä. i. quae iusserit mi (l. iusserat om. mi),' he supposes the writer had before him *iussa a*. Francken points out the ambiguity of this: *ego mandata tuli* or *accepti quae imperaueram*? He reads in his text *iuss a* (i.e. the right of candidature for consulship) which is certainly at first sight attractive. But his objection to *iussa* is unconvincing; *iussa* may well be right and the scholiasts have blundered. If right, it probably means no more than Haskins and Micyllus explain: 'a me, et coacta, scilicet ut suffragia ferret.' We

may cf. Ter. Eūn. 2. 3. 16: *iubesne? iubeo cogo atque impero*. For *bella*, Bentley unnecessarily suggested *iura*: '*quomodo negatos per bella, quos per bella ciuilia obtinuit*.' The phrase can hardly mean 'during my Gallic wars,' the alternative explanation put forward by the C. scholiast, but 'denied, refused me by the armed action of the senate.'

Bk. VI. l. 217.

ille moras ferri neruorum et uincula rumpit.

Mr. Smale credits Haskins and Weise with the interpretation 'he breaks . . .' which neither gives. Haskins says nothing about *rumpit*, and Weise renders it as *eruit*. Mr. Ridley agrees with Weise: 'bursts the nerves and tears the shaft forth with the eyeball' but drops *moras*. Instances however of *rumpo* in the sense of *euello*, *eruo* seems very rare. Lucan can hardly mean Scaeva to actually break the steel. Mr. Smale's suggestion that *moras ferri* is all that holds the spear's course, i.e. the eye itself, is not free from objection, apart from the oddness of the Latin. It is surely more natural here to think of the hindrance caused by the spear. And the following lines 218 and 219, *adfixam uellens oculo pendente sagittam | intrepidus telumque suo cum lumine calcat*—where the scholiast wrongly explains *non pede proterens sed despiciens forti animo*—take note of both eye and spear and presuppose a similar balance in l. 217. Haskins translates *neruorum uincula* as 'the ligaments of the nerves.' *Neruorum* may refer rather to the little sinews and muscles of the eye, and *uincula rumpit* is like *moras rumpit* a stock poetical phrase. The literal translation therefore would be: 'he ends the delay caused by the spear and bursts the bonds of the muscles,' i.e. he is checked for a moment by the spear in his eye, but pulls it forth as explained in the

next line; the eye ligaments maimed and pierced by the spear are conceived quite in Lucan's manner as bonds restraining him from fighting.

Bk. VI. l. 427.

fata queat; quis prodat aues, quis fulgura caeli seruet et Assyria scrutetur sidera cura.

Large assumptions are involved in supposing that the birds are 'endowed with the foreknowledge of the future, which the haruspex steals from them and tells to men.' Nor does Mr. Smale seem right in saying that L. uses *prodat* (i.e. in the meaning 'betray') 'in its full sense.' *Prodat* means 'records' or 'publishes' the birds, i.e. the omens or auguries derived from the birds' flight. The forced terseness is characteristic of Lucan and the Silver Age generally, cf. 2.35 *diuise deos* and the examples quoted by Mr. Heitland in his Introduction to Haskin's edition p. lxxx. Francken suspects corruption: *legitur vulgo 'quis . . . queat' quasi ageretur de homine probando non de re noscitanda, cum tamen praecedat: "quid sonet Dodone."* V has *fibris* which he adopts, taking *quis* = *quibus* and understanding Sextus as subject to *queat*. Further on *quis prodat aues* he notes the peculiarity of style, and adds *nec quaeritur num quis sit augur sed quid augurium prodat*. He reads *quid prodat aues*, supposing *auis* to have been corrupted into *aues*, and a subsequent change of *quid* to *quis*. But these changes are unnecessary. Lucan is no such nice logician. And the final *quis* (l. 428, *quis fulgura caeli . . .*) which does not lend itself so readily to change Francken is forced to account for *uariandi causa*. This is as good as giving up his case. The conservative critic may see a touch of unconscious humour in *uariandi causa*!

H. STEWART.

University of Liverpool.

NOTE

XENOPHON, *HELLENICA* II. ii.:
THE CONSPIRACY OF THE
ΚΑΛΑΜΗΦΟΡΟΙ.

XENOPHON narrates that after the defeat of Arginusae the Peloponnesian sailors at Chios, when winter came, found themselves destitute of food and clothing. In their extremity they plotted a raid upon the city. The badge of the conspirators was to carry a cane (κάλαμος). Eteonicus, now commander-in-chief, was at a loss what to do; the cane-bearers were too numerous for open measures of repression; so he took a squad of fifteen marines, armed with daggers, and patrolled the city. He happened to meet a man with sore eyes just coming from the doctor's, carrying a cane, and promptly put him to death. This made a sensation, and people wanted to know why the man had been killed. Eteonicus caused the answer to be put about, 'because he carried a cane.' The conspirators were frightened, and quietly disembarassed themselves of the incriminating token. Then Eteonicus induced the citizens to contribute a fund; ordered his crews on board; harangued them ship by ship without alluding to what had taken place; gave them a month's pay all round; and so saved the situation.

If I read this artless anecdote aright, it has not been intelligibly reproduced

in any of the books that are most often in our hands. Busolt, Holm, and Underhill are silent or omit the details; but Thirlwall, Grote, Dakyns and Professor Bury all imply that the unfortunate ὀφθαλμιῶν was one of the conspirators. Thirlwall naïvely remarks that the fact that he had this disease and had just come out of a surgeon's house 'made the deed [*i.e.*, his murder] more remarkable.' Surely the point is that he was *not* a conspirator, but a chance passer-by, who being almost blind was carrying a cane to feel his way along the street. Grote and Prof. Bury translate κάλαμος 'a straw,' and speak of the conspirators as 'wearing a straw'—after the manner, I suppose, of Sam Weller. Thirlwall and Dakyns call it a reed. For a κάλαμος as a walking-stick *cf.* Horace, equitare in arundine longa, and LXX., 4 Kings, xviii. 21, νῦν ἰδοῦ πέποιθας σαυτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν ῥάβδον τὴν καλαμίνην τὴν τεθλασμένην ταύτην, ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον; ὅς ἂν στηριχθῇ ἀνὴρ ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τρήσει αὐτήν.

From the dictionaries it appears that the κάλαμος was used as a fishing-rod, an arrow, and a measuring-rod; the arundo also as a cane for corporal punishment.

H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

REVIEWS

THE WORKS OF ARISTOTLE.

De Partibus Animalium. By WILLIAM OGLE. Translated into English under the Editorship of J. A. Smith and W. D. Ross. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. 5s. net.

ARISTOTLE refers to the *De Partibus Animalium* as an enquiry into the causes that in each case have determined the composition of animals. In the *Historia Animalium* the parts are described, for although this work is to

some extent physiological, its main object was to deal with the anatomy of the parts. The *De Partibus Animalium*, on the other hand, is almost exclusively teleological and physiological, and consequently treats of the functions of the parts. Aristotle's attitude was essentially that of a teleologist but only in a limited degree, for he appears to have taken that view of life which Bergson calls the doctrine of internal finality (that is to say, that each indi-

vidual, or at any rate each species, is made for itself, that all its parts conspire for the greatest good of the whole, and are intelligently organised in view of that end but without regard for other organisms or kinds of organisms). Since every organ or part of the body was held to have its peculiar function, the existence of vestigial or rudimentary organs was unrecognised. This was the doctrine of internal finality which remained current until Darwin elaborated his theory of natural selection. The wider doctrine of external finality, according to which living beings are ordered in regard to one another, never gained acceptance among scientific philosophers, and the only indication that Aristotle ever adopted it is furnished by a passage in which he suggests that the mouth in Selachians is placed on the under surface so as to allow their prey to escape while the fish are turning on their backs before taking their food.

The *De Partibus Animalium* opens with an introduction devoted to general considerations. This is followed by a discussion of the three degrees of composition, the first degree being composition of physical substances, the second degree, of homogeneous parts or tissues, and the third, of heterogeneous parts or organs. The tissues referred to are blood, fat, marrow, brain, flesh, and bone. After describing these, the organs are dealt with, and a consideration of their respective functions, firstly in sanguineous animals (*i.e.* in Vertebrates) and secondly in bloodless animals (*i.e.* Invertebrates), occupies the remainder of the book. The account given of the physiology of the blood is especially interesting, and it is noteworthy that Aristotle realised something of the nature of the process of absorption whereby the food becomes converted into nutriment which is carried by the blood to all parts of the body. He supposed, however, that the matter derived from the gut passed first to the heart in the form of vapour or serum, and that it was there converted into true blood by a process of concoction. Aristotle knew nothing of the true nature of respiration, and he regarded the lungs as serving to temper the

bodily heat by means of the inspired air. He was also entirely ignorant of the fact that the blood passes back to the heart and lungs after supplying the tissues and organs with nourishment. On the other hand he fully appreciated the existence of excretory organs, the function of which was to remove from the body such substances as could not be utilised. In this category are included fluids such as bile, urine and sweat. In the section on the gall bladder it is remarkable how wonderfully correct Aristotle is in his statements regarding the presence or absence of that organ in the different species enumerated. He points out that the gall bladder is not found either in the horse and ass or in the deer and roe, but is generally present in the sheep and goat. In the light of the knowledge that he possessed, therefore, Aristotle could scarcely have adopted a theory about this organ which has found expression in modern veterinary textbooks. According to this theory the gall bladder is present in the sheep and cow because these being ruminating animals, bile is only required at certain particular times when food passes into the duodenum, whereas in the horse, which does not chew the cud, but yet is constantly eating, food is continually passing into the intestine and consequently a perpetual flow of bile is desirable. Since the gall bladder is present in the non-ruminating pig but absent in the ruminating deer and roe, it is difficult to see how this theory can be applied.

The present edition is a re-issue of Dr. Ogle's translation which was first published twenty years ago. One misses the illuminating introduction and the essay upon 'The main groups of animals,' but it was inevitable that these should be excluded in the present edition. The notes also are very much curtailed, but Dr. Ogle has had an opportunity of bringing these up to date. We notice, however, that he still uses such words as 'Solidungula,' which is no longer found in modern works on systematic zoology. In referring to the 'reed' or fourth stomach in ruminants we think it might have been pointed out that this is the only true digestive

stomach. In the horse the colon rather than the caecum is to be regarded as representing functionally a second stomach, since digestive changes are more considerable in the former organ, the caecum being largely a storehouse for liquids. In discussing the position of the mammae it might have been mentioned that in the Caviidae these are practically pectoral in position. Dr. Ogle is not quite correct in saying that cartilage is never present in the copulatory organ excepting in various Carnivora and occasionally in man, since fibro-cartilage undoubtedly occurs in the filiform prolongation of the penis of the ram and probably also in other rumin-

ants. It is to be noted that Dr. Ogle occasionally includes an observation of his own, for example where he says that fleas in jumping use all their legs and not merely the posterior pair. There are some omissions in the index (e.g. 'Gills,' an account of which occupies more than a page of the text), but a work of this kind is bound to have minor defects.

In conclusion we cannot omit to express our gratitude to Balliol College (and more particularly to the late Master) as well as to the Oxford University Press for providing English biologists with this excellent series of translations.

F. H. A. MARSHALL.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

TRAVELS AND STUDIES IN THE NEARER EAST.

Travels and Studies in the Nearer East.

By A. T. OLMSTEAD, B. B. CHARLES, and J. E. WRENCH. Vol. I., Part II. *Hittite Inscriptions*. New York: Ithaca, 1911.

THIS excellently-printed volume is the first-fruits of the 'Cornell Expedition to Asia Minor and the Assy-Babylonian Orient.' It is a welcome addition to the library of what the Germans have christened 'Hittitology.' The members of the Expedition have carefully examined and surveyed all the known as well as some previously unknown Hittite monuments of eastern Asia Minor. For the first time we have photographs and squeezes of the inscriptions made under the most favourable conditions and without regard to expenditure of time. When an inscribed rock was reached, we are told, it was first cleaned, and a hand copy of the inscription made after the squeeze paper had been laid upon it. The squeeze, still in its position, was also photographed when the sun's shadow was longest, and 'when the inscription was of special difficulty, the squeeze was taken off a character at a time, so that the original rock and each side of the squeeze could be examined together.' The student thus possesses at last the most perfect reproductions of the inscriptions that can be made.

Even so the accurate reading of them is a matter of extreme difficulty. Many of them are in relief, and the weathering of the stone is apt not only to obliterate but still more to disguise the forms of the characters. Where the inscriptions are incised, the characters are frequently in a still more illegible state. It would be bad enough in the case of a Greek inscription, but where the system of writing is still imperfectly known and our ignorance of the language prevents us from knowing what words we should expect to find, the difficulties of an accurate transcription are increased a hundredfold. The photograph, for instance, of the longer inscription at Gurun, taken by the Cornell Expedition, enables us for the first time to read it with anything approaching certainty. The same may be said of the lower inscription at Ivriz.

One of the most hopeless of the Hittite inscriptions of Asia Minor was the lengthy one on the Nishan Tash or 'Beacon Stone' discovered many years ago by Prof. Perrot at Boghaz Keui. Perrot's photograph showed that it contained Hittite hieroglyphs: the attempts since made to photograph or copy it have not succeeded in showing even that much. The inscription now lies before us, I will not say in a legible condition, but in a condition which places its Hittite origin beyond question

and may hereafter allow me to restore some of the names contained in it. As it is, I think I see the name of Carchemish in the ninth line.

The only disappointing photograph is that of the Aleppo inscription, which is even less clear than some of those which we already possess. That the photographs should be so poor is the more astonishing in that the inscription itself is remarkably distinct: when I examined it last year there was hardly a character the form of which was in any way doubtful. As a result of the imperfection of the photograph the copy made from it is naturally not altogether correct.

It goes without saying that in the hand-copies of other inscriptions also an examination of the photographs shows that there are characters which are questionable or incorrect. But the materials are now in our hands for correcting all inaccuracies so far as is possible, and the best thanks of the 'Hittitologist' are due for the pains and labour that have been spent in obtaining them. If we fail to decipher the Hittite texts of Asia Minor it will no longer be because the reading of the texts is uncertain.

A. H. SAYCE.

Queen's College, Oxford.

NUMISMATIQUE CONSTANTINIENNE.

Numismatique Constantinienne. Par JULES MAURICE. Tome II. Large xvo. Pp. cxxxvi + 612. With 17 photographic plates. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1911. 25 fr.

M. MAURICE is to be congratulated on the rapid progress he is making towards the completion of his formidable but most useful task. Twenty or thirty years ago the numismatics of the Constantinian period seemed to be almost hopelessly obscure and confused. Now, thanks to his labours and to those of Voetter and other pioneers, order and precision have taken the place of chaos and uncertainty. Individual coins can be assigned to their proper date and position in the series with something that is not far removed from mathematical exactitude. The system that governed the organisation of the imperial mints at this time stands revealed in its entirety, and it proves to be very much what we should have expected from an administration that had inherited the ideals of a Diocletian. Once the clues have been discovered, the prevailing symmetry renders minute classification a comparatively easy matter: it would not be surprising if the Constantinian catalogues of the future were to become as succinct and as synoptic as trigonometrical tables. Nor is it by any species of legerdemain that such a result has been achieved. The

miracle has been wrought through the careful scrutiny and comparison of thousands of individual specimens. We are merely witnessing the triumph of scientific method as applied to ancient coins.

The main body of the present volume comprises detailed descriptions of the issues of the following mints—London, Lyons, Arles, Tarraco, Siscia, Serdica, Sirmium, Thessalonica, Constantinople, and the Thracian Heraclea. These descriptions are, of course, not new to the specialist; most, if not all, of them have already been published as *Vorarbeiten* in one or other of the numismatic journals of the various European countries. But the reader who is acquainted with Vol. I. will turn with eager anticipation to the Introduction, which contains the second instalment of M. Maurice's account of the general fruits of his researches. The first was notable for the flood of light which it shed upon the iconography of the period. Here the interest is at least equally absorbing, while the circle appealed to is considerably wider. Secular and ecclesiastical history alike are illuminated by M. Maurice's interpretations of his material. To begin with, we have a clear and firmly sketched outline of the evolution of Constantine's own religious beliefs and professions as these are reflected in the coins; with the aid of documentary authorities we can

follow the process by which the representative upon earth of Hercules became transformed first into a champion of the solar cult—subsequently made so prominent by Julian—and then into a Christian. The true significance of the Edict of Milan is well brought out, and evidence collected from many quarters as to the consistency with which the policy of toleration was pursued. The real importance of the ceremony of A.D. 330 for the history of Constantinople is convincingly explained. Up till then the whole administration of the city had been pagan; from that date onwards Christianity was of necessity the official religion. A very attractive chapter recites the facts regarding the appearance of Christian signs and symbols on the coins of the different imperial mints. It is shown that, when these first occur on the dies, they represent the handiwork of comparatively humble local officials—a perfectly natural phenomenon, considering that Diocletian was positively hostile to Christianity and would remove its sympathisers from all the higher administrative posts. During

Constantine's later years the adherents of the new faith occupied, of course, a far more favourable position, and it is therefore not surprising to find 'the way' making its influence felt at the seat of the central Government, whence were despatched the patterns and instructions that had to be followed in the provinces. The last section of the Introduction consists of an examination of a number of the reverse types, the object being to illustrate the extent to which Neoplatonism dominated thought in the Roman world at this particular period.

The arrangement of the book is lucid, the printing clear, and the photographic plates quite satisfactory. The number of trivial misprints in the Introduction is, however, unduly large. It is to be hoped that greater vigilance has been exercised in verifying the readings of the coins. We cordially wish the author good speed with his final volume, which is to comprise descriptions of the issues of Cyzicus, Nicomedia, Antioch and Alexandria, and is to be accompanied by an exhaustive series of indexes.

GEORGE MACDONALD.

EGYPTIAN GNOSTICISM.

Eine Mithrasliturgie. Erläutert von ALBRECHT DIETERICH. Zweite Auflage. 8vo. Pp. xii + 248. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910.

DIETERICH did not live to see the second edition of this book. Yet respect will best be shown to the dead, if we consider his work with the same frankness as would be demanded by the living. For the *Mithrasliturgie* has exercised a considerable influence upon some recent speculations. This influence has been partly due to the character of the document itself, partly to the material which Dieterich accumulated for the sake of illustration.

Dieterich has given the name of a Mithras liturgy to a long passage which he has taken from a Greek magical papyrus. Immediately after the so-called liturgy there follows a passage of a similar character which is treated by the editor as if it were a separate document. Roughly speaking, the whole

document, so far as it is reprinted by Dieterich, is a series of magical instructions by which immortality may be attained. Those who have any acquaintance with the magical papyri of Egypt may guess at the nature of the contents: for those who have not such an acquaintance a word or two will be sufficient. The greatest influence is thought to be exercised by the use of certain words or sounds in a certain order. But this influence is to be helped out by the gestures of the magician, and by the use of materials, animal and vegetable, according to precedent. The hotchpotch of nonsense contains here and there sentences which bear some meaning. But they are blended with long strings of meaningless combinations of letters. It is well to speak plainly. The persons who composed these magical papyri were of an exceedingly low order of intelligence. Almost the only passages in which they exhibit some purpose of a rational kind are

those in which it is necessary to commend their wares to the public. I take it that many of these papyri were thought to be operative even by their mere presence, and that they carried on the tradition by which the Book of the Dead was believed to secure the immortality of the person in whose coffin it was laid. Dieterich treats with undeserved respect the rigmoroles of an Egyptian vendor of magic.

It is not difficult to reduce the so-called liturgy of Mithras to its proper value. If the traces of philosophic ideas and the occasional allusions to Pronoia Tyche Helios Mithra suffice to establish the liturgical character of the first part, what are we to say about the seven lines which are quoted from the *Iliad* and the names of Zeus and Ares which occur in the second part of Dieterich's text? This second part is described as 'An Instruction for the Magical Employment of the *Mithras-liturgie*.' It might with equal reason be labelled 'A Liturgy of Zeus.' It might also be described as 'The Occult Meaning of Homer.' But where are we to stop, if a casual allusion is enough to determine the nature and value of a document? The canons of literary criticism are really worth remembering now and then by the critics of religious tradition. A very simple application of them will deliver serious students from nightmares such as this magical papyrus.

But I do not think that the reader of Dieterich's essay will find his time wasted. Even if the text is badly chosen the sermon is instructive for all that. However, before going on to the essay, I should like to draw attention to a remarkable coincidence. In what I have ventured—following Dieterich's precedent—to call the Liturgy of Zeus, we are told Zeus went up into a mountain with a golden calf and a silver sword. He gave a share to all; no one he left without a share. And he said: 'Cast away what thou hast and thou shalt receive $\psi\omega\omega\theta\epsilon\rho\ \nu\omega\psi\iota\theta\epsilon\rho\ \theta\epsilon\rho\nu\omega\psi\iota$.' Now this sentence in the Liturgy of Zeus gains meaning when we find a similar phrase in the Coptic *Pistis Sophia*, p. 375 (Schwartz), $\psi\omega\omega\theta\epsilon\rho\ \theta\epsilon\rho\omega\psi\iota\omega\ \omega\psi\iota\theta\epsilon\rho$. This phrase is ad-

dressed by Jesus to His Father. By the insertion of ν in the second Coptic word, and the removal of the final ν from the end of the second to the beginning of the third word, the *Pistis Sophia* is brought into agreement with the magical papyrus. Are we to interpret this as meaning that Zeus promises to those who obey the instructions, that they shall receive the Father of all? Or are we to suppose that the compiler of the *Pistis Sophia* stuffed out his book with names drawn from all sources? I am afraid that the latter alternative is the correct one. This magical papyrus is a typical expression of the Egyptian mind. It looks back to the magical papyri of the Later Egyptian Empire and forward to Christian productions in the same kind, such as the *Pistis Sophia* and the Gnostic books edited by Schmidt.

The reader must not suppose that this coincidence is the only one. I imagine that many similar coincidences await a careful examination. There is one leading example, however. The seven Greek vowels appear alike in the magical papyrus, the *Pistis Sophia* and the Gnostic books. In partial or complete combinations and permutations they form names possessed of magical power. The famous inscription in the wall of the Theatre at Miletus shows how widespread was the belief in the power of the vowels. But this arose through their association with the seven planets (Maass, *Tagesgötter*, 224). And it is probable that the strange combinations of vowels which meet the eye in all these Egyptian writings arose from the use of the Greek letters to symbolise the planets. Thus Babylonian astrology combines with Greek philosophising to furnish material for the Egyptian magicians.

Enormous confusion is caused in the study of Christian origins by the failure to distinguish the magical writings which shelter themselves under the name of Gnosticism, from the writings of men like Valentinus Heracleon or Ptolemaeus. If we set Ptolemaeus's letter to Flora over against the *Pistis Sophia*, Heracleon's commentary upon the *Fourth Gospel* over against the caricatures of Gnosticism which appear in the

Fathers, or Plotinus's criticisms against the kind of Gnosticism which appears in the magical papyri, we shall have made clear to ourselves a very useful distinction. We shall not confuse any longer the literature of real thought and feeling with the rubbish drawn from a low grade of experience. We shall even have made a beginning towards the proper application of the comparative method. The context in which a thought appears counts for much. There is some reason in comparing the primitive ideas of the magical papyri with the ideas of primitive men; on the other hand, it is impossible to interpret the highest kinds of experience by anything but themselves. Comparative folklore has something to learn from sociology. And the first lesson is to set side by side similar stages of culture. It is not helpful to begin by lumping together what is different. And that is what Dieterich did with his so-called liturgy. The main part of his book is directed to explaining the dogmas of the Christian religion by comparisons which range through all the degrees of fantasy. It is not the place now to show how ludicrous are the results which follow from the mistake in method. Perhaps I may leave the judgment of these matters to those better qualified than myself. All I will venture to say is this, that Dieterich does not inspire the cautious reader with confidence when he enters upon the field of Christian origins.

The magical papyrus, if we treat it for what it is and put on one side what it is not, namely, a liturgy of Mithra, has already furnished us with one clue in the name which we discovered again in the *Pistis Sophia*. To the student of folklore many other suggestions present themselves. To take one example. There is an accomplishment, namely, levitation, which is promised by the author of the papyrus, about which Dieterich might with advantage have said something. 'Draw your breath three times and you will see yourself rising aloft and going on high so that you seem to be in the middle of the air.' Perhaps Dieterich passed over this striking passage for lack of analogies. But there are many reported cases of

levitation, although the evidence is not always of the best. And these cases are found among spiritualist mediums whose style of composition and liveliness offer a very close resemblance to the vendors of magical papyri.

The conflict of the early church with the Gnostics was fought out at two levels. This papyrus illustrates the lower level, and some of the cases are recorded in which the dealers in magic yielded to a superior power. The most striking example is that of Ephesus (Acts xix. 19). It is probable that the historians of the Church have treated these magical books too seriously. At least we should distinguish such productions from astrological works which do at least present some system of rational thought, faulty though the data may be. Elymas and Simon Magus are obscure figures, but on the evidence it seems reasonable to compare them rather with the Egyptian magicians than with the Chaldaean astrologers.

It would be unbecoming to criticise so vigorously the work of a man recently dead, except for the fact that Dieterich's influence has been in my opinion a source of danger. The easy comparisons of which he avails himself have been imitated by persons of less scholarship. I hope that I shall not be considered unduly obscurantist if I decline to follow out the theories which Dieterich and his followers have grafted upon second and third rate products of popular Egyptian literature. When Dieterich interprets the thoughts of a great man like Paul by the unreason of mercantile and therefore silly religionists, it is not at all surprising that persons like Professor Drews and Mr. J. M. Robertson (who, I believe, is also a member of the present Ministry) get befogged. 'Both writers,' says Canon Cheyne, 'have paid the penalty of their audacity in a plentiful crop of errors.' One instance will satisfy the readers of this review. Both these gentlemen connect the name Jesus with Jasios or Jason, 'the mythic name of a pupil of Chiron in the art of healing' (*Hibbert Journal*, Vol. IX., 659). When Dieterich acknowledges the assistance of Drews (168 n.) one begins to be

sorry. I believe Professor Drews is a man of excellent intentions. And if he has been misled into thinking that the comparative method has no bounds, it is impossible to acquit the school to which Dieterich belonged.

The comparative method comes in when ordinary historical inquiry has reached the end of its resources. And a first duty of the scholar who employs the comparative method is to mark off the distinctions as well as the resem-

blances which his subject-matter presents. This so-called liturgy of Mithra contains material which will not be turned to account unless it is approached from an entirely different standpoint. It is an example of a huge class of papyri which should be investigated for their own sake before they are turned to account in the history of religion.

FRANK GRANGER.

LECTURES ON GREEK POETRY.

Lectures on Greek Poetry. By J. W. MACKAIL, M.A., LL.D., sometime Fellow of Balliol College, Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. 1 vol. Demy 8vo. Pp. xvii+273. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1910. 9s. 6d. net.

THIS book is refreshing to a tired mind. We seem to hear the conversation of a pleasant talker, lucid, sensitive, fastidious, touching with delicate precision the qualities of poetry for which he cares, by fresh and apt comparisons renewing the life of familiar things, and communicating, as we listen, something of his personality and something also of his feeling for the poetry. As after such conversation it is hard, indeed it is impossible, to say 'Here I agreed: this I rejected: so much I have acquired,' so it is difficult to review this book. The author treats poetry as a function of life, 'of which it is at once an interpretation and a pattern,' and his aim is to help us towards the attainment of those moments which are the reward of reading, when 'it may be with some great poem, it may be only with some passage or phrase, we enter fully and freshly into it, as though we read it for the first time and as though it gave us the meaning of life.' This means that we find it difficult to say what exactly, besides the pleasure, we have gained; but the gain is not the less for that. It means also that the new appreciation which we gain is limited by the personality of the author. That limitation is inevitable. As surely as no interpre-

tation can be greater than the interpreter, so surely an attempt at interpretation that is not personal must fail.

Mr. Mackail has chosen for study Homer, Sappho, Simonides, Sophocles, Theocritus, and Apollonius, because each of these poets seems to him to embody the poetical movement of some age in the life which Greek poetry interprets. Though we doubt whether Sappho more than Alcaeus, Simonides more than Pindar, 'absorbed and communicated the effective integrated meaning of poetry as it had then been reached,' and suspect that there is more of Athens in Euripides than in Sophocles, the choice is probably good. All these poets are valuable chiefly as poets, for their poetical quality, not for their thought nor for any other secondary reason, and all, if I may be allowed to say so, are poets with whom Mr. Mackail seems peculiarly fitted to deal. It is the personal note that gives the value, while it limits the scope, of the criticism, and if we had heard more of Aeschylus and Euripides we might have felt that our time had been less profitably spent.

After an introductory chapter on the Homeric question, not intended, and therefore not to be criticised, as a contribution to the argument (though it is interesting to notice that in Mr. Mackail's opinion the creator of the *Iliad* may have been the author of the *Odyssey*, and that the theory of Wilamowitz with regard to the 'Cyclic' epics is summarily dismissed), we pass to an appreciation of Homer. The Greeks

'had their Middle Ages,' and 'the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are the image which the modern world of Greece formed and kept of the medieval world that had preceded it.' The comparison is in a certain sense and degree just: there is something feudal in Homeric society,¹ and the warriors are chivalrous, the women touched with romance. But Mr. Mackail himself points out that something, perhaps 'the harder Hellenic taste,' has put restraint upon the romance, and it may be added, since the word 'medieval' is becoming a favourite label for the pre-Homeric age, that we know very little about that age and that, so far as we know it, the differences between it and our Middle Ages are greater than the resemblances. The analogy is valuable only if it is used with care. It is true, for instance, that 'the repetition of Homer was, like that of flowers in a tapestry or diapers in a painting, deliberate in the artist and delightful to his audience,' and again, that 'the epic perspective, like that of the early painting, represents the secondary planes on practically the same scale as the primary.' This is a different matter from the introduction of words like *pavises* and *perrières* and names like Durindana and Tryggvesson into a description of a Homeric fight. Nor does the suggestion that William Morris is the most Homeric of English poets help us much towards appreciation of Homer.

But there is much that helps: the insistence on the poetical value of fire and darkness in the *Iliad*, the treatment of epithets and similes, the contrast with Hesiod, the analysis of the *Odyssey* and the selection of the speech of Penelope with its nightingale-simile ('a miracle of language, but of language that is passing from epic into lyric') as the point at which the organic structure begins to break down, and the clear assertion that the greatness of Homer depends on the sense he gives 'of the splendid energy of human life.'

In the remaining chapters the author speaks with a surer and more intimate

feeling. His account of the decline of the lyric is excellent. With regard to the life of Sappho, having rejected scandalous misinterpretation of her love-poems, he seems inclined to the opposite extreme of suggesting that because she wrote perfect poetry she was a perfect woman: even so, a perfect woman in the Lesbos of Sappho may well have been different from a perfect lady of late Victorian England. When he comes to the fragments, Mr. Mackail is at his best. Simonides is treated 'not only as the link between Ionia and Athens, but, broadly speaking, as the first of the great Athenian poets.' At a time when poetry was faced with a new demand 'while remaining poetry to do the work of prose,' Simonides trod with a sure foot the narrow path between the prosaic and the consciously and artificially poetical. He is compared, in each case justly, with Sophocles, Horace, and Wordsworth. The style of Pindar, we may add, is compared to that of Meredith, with an amusing exactness so far as concerns the examples adduced.

The chapter on Sophocles seems to me to be the best. One great merit is that it does not dress the poet as a moralist or a religious 'teacher.' 'It is neither ethics nor theology that Sophocles gives us; it is something which is larger and deeper.'

Finally, there is an interesting chapter on the Alexandrians, an appreciation of Theocritus as a many-sided artist (the comparison with Tennyson seems to be pressed too far), and of Apollonius as the representative of the romantic epic.

On p. 31 there is a sentence about Dante, the pronouns of which are difficult, and on p. 41 there is an apparently platitudinous remark, which in future editions one would not be sorry to miss. Perhaps a small criticism of the style must be made: in some passages there is an excess of stylistic repetition, not due to the fact that the lectures were delivered at long intervals to changing audiences, but rather to a somewhat lavish use of the 'medieval' decorative artifice.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

¹ See, however, Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth*, p. 87.

HISTORY OF EPIRUS.

Epirotische Geschichte bis zum Jahre 280 v. Chr. Von CARL KLOTZSCH. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 240. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1911. M. 6.

No historian of Epirus can afford to ignore the geographical features of the country. It is probable that Herr Carl Klotzsch writes without a traveller's first-hand knowledge; otherwise he would not speak with such optimism of the communications between Onchesmus on the north-west coast and the Hellopian plain near the ancient Dodona (p. 9), or imply (on p. 1) that difficult mountain chains cut off this plain from Aetolia and the south. In reality, as he elsewhere remarks, the mountains of Epirus lie in ranges parallel with the coast. Thus the Hellopian plain, which is the fertile heart of the country, has at all times been most easily accessible from the south, and has therefore stood in close relations with the region of the Ambracian Gulf and not with the island of Corcyra.

This geographical fact throws considerable doubt on the thesis of the first chapter, in which the author follows Kärst's theory of a fifth-century Chaonian ἀρχή based on the statement of Theopompus in Strabo VII. 324, that the Chaonians ruled Epirus before the Molossians, and on ambiguous passages in Thucydides II. 80 and 81, where Chaonians receive particular mention as the μαχιμώτατοι τῶν περὶ ἐκεῖνα τὰ χωρία. The Chaonians lived on the north-west coast near Onchesmus, and therefore would perhaps be the best known of the Epirot tribes to the Greeks in the Ionian Islands, but the story of Themistocles at the Court of Admetus proves Molossian pre-eminence forty years before the Ambracian War celebrated by Thucydides. It is therefore natural to conclude that the Chaonian ἀρχή of Theopompus refers to a much earlier period, probably before the foundation of Ambracia created a safe trade-route through Aetolia to Calydon or Naupactus.

Herr Klotzsch is most successful when he deals with purely political history. He establishes by means of intricate

chronological arguments and a full use of scanty evidence a satisfactory table of the Epirot Kings from Tharyps to Pyrrhus. The most important point which he brings out is the division of the descendants of Alcetas I into two parties, Nationalist and pro-Macedonian. The sway of the political pendulum brought many changes of fortune, and we find Neoptolemus II enjoying three separate periods of power, divided by two six-year intervals of a Nationalist régime. The relations of Epirus with Athens and Sparta, and later with Pherae and Macedonia, are carefully studied on a basis of arguments which will, on the whole, find general acceptance. We might take exception, however, to the frequent use of the list of Pyrrhus' troops in Italy, given by Dionysius of Halicarnassus for establishing the extent of his dominions, since it cannot be argued that all the races introduced as μισθοφόροι were his actual subjects. One is also disappointed to find no adequate explanation of Pyrrhus' apparent faithlessness and folly in his dealings with Demetrius Poliorcetes. Plutarch seems to be followed here with too much docility. There is an occasional lack of proportion in the author's treatment of political events. Thus pp. 135-147 contain an account of the battle of Ipsus, with its causes and results, quite out of proportion to its importance from the Epirot point of view, while the Italian expedition of Alexander the Molossian is barely mentioned. Still, on the whole, the treatment of the political history of Epirus from 429-280 is a valuable addition to our knowledge.

On the other hand, the book is full of disappointments, for there is practically nothing but political history in it. Not only does this limitation create a certain tediousness in the end, but it entails the omission of two of the most interesting points in Epirot history—the ethnological origin of the inhabitants, especially as regards their Dorian affinities, and the explanation of the extraordinary late bloom of city-state culture, which produced the wonderful bronzes of Paramythia, and which surprises us in

the campaign of Aemilius Paulus with a record of 150,000 slaves ravished from 70 cities.

With neither of these points does the author attempt to deal. He leaves Epirus a land of villages and gives no hint of further development. A 50-line note on ethnology gives us little more information than Kärst's article in Pauly-Wissowa, and any further attention to the social and economic, quite apart from the ethnological, position of Epirus is strictly banned. The mention of the *προστιάται* with their analogies in the Spartan ephors, the exceptional position of women, the traces of dual kingship, and even the striking oath given in Plutarch, which exactly reproduces the monthly oath of the Spartan Kings, fail to stir the author to a discussion of this problem. The question of Dodona and its bronze age receives

no serious consideration. Even the constitutional system is not fully treated, and we are left very vague in our ideas of the relations of King, *prostates*, and League.

Minor points of criticism are the want of a bibliography or a list of abbreviations, some haste in the compiling of the Index, and an irritating want of system in transliteration, which admits of Lysimacheia and Lysimachia, Chae-rona and Koroneia, Euboea and Beroia, Epirus and Ephesos, Pyrrhus and Demetrios, Aeacus and Aeakides.

Still, Herr Klotzsch's success in reconstructing Epirot political history is such that we lay down the book with regret at its abrupt closure in 280 B.C., just when it was beginning to be really interesting.

GUY DICKINS.

THE THUNDER-WEAPON IN RELIGION AND FOLKLORE.

The Thunder-weapon in Religion and Folklore. A Study in Comparative Archaeology. By CHR. BLINKENBERG, Ph.D. Cambridge Archaeological and Ethnological Series. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 122. 36 phototype and outline illustrations. Cambridge University Press, 1911. 5s.

DR. BLINKENBERG has given us a model monograph, learned, cautious, yet illuminating. What emerges from the great wealth of regional facts surveyed is, briefly, as follows:

Over three continents—Europe, Asia, and Africa—in those regions where thunderstorms are fairly frequent and violent, the belief in thunderstones has existed and still exists. That is, it is believed (in contradiction, of course, to actual fact) that the destructive stroke of the lightning is caused by the descent of a stone. Flash and thunderclap are mere accessories. In regions where thunderstorms are absent or unimportant, *e.g.* Iceland and Egypt, the belief may exist, but it is imported, not indigenous. But on the two remaining continents—America and Australia—though thunderstorms abound, such a

belief is practically unknown, or, when known, clearly imported. In America, *e.g.* thunder is produced by a large thunder-bird; in Australia it is associated with the bull-roarer. Dr. Blinkenberg concludes that the Old-world belief in thunderstones and their manifold virtues originated in one, not several, centres.

In Europe, Asia, and Africa it is most frequently pre-historic stone antiquities, flint weapons, celts, etc., that pass for thunderstones; but besides these—the point is important—other stones of notable shape, colour, appearance, *e.g.*, belemnites, echinities, rock crystals, globular stones, are accounted as having the same origin and the like magical powers. Now it is in regard to this question of stone-implements as thunder-weapons that the originality of Dr. Blinkenberg's view comes in. Somewhat unconsciously it would seem, but all the more convincingly, he stands for the new psychology as contrasted with the elder rationalism. He marks an epoch in the interpretation of religious phenomena. The older school still finds the origin of man's religion in his primitive scientific curiosity. He found

stone weapons, the use of which was lost to him. He asked, 'What are these?' He answered, 'They are the weapons of the sky-god,' his thunderbolts. It follows on this view that the sanctity of celts and the like is post-stone age. The new school says religion arises mainly not from man's rationalism, but from his reactions: he feels emotions first, and asks questions later. It is when he uses the stone weapon, when he feels it as a wondrous extension of his personality, *not when he has forgotten its use*, that it is to him sacred, *i.e.* a vehicle of *mana*, an instrument of *tabu*. The source of his *religio* is his reaction towards the thunder, not his curiosity about the relic. This is complicit, though scarcely explicit in Dr. Blinkenberg's new theory (pp. 35-37), and we are entirely with him.

We have space only to note one special point which should instruct and delight the classical scholar. Preller, Gruppe, Bull and, following them, Prof. Ridgeway, have misinterpreted the trident, as in origin a fish-spear. A fishing-spear it became to fit Posidon as a sea-god—that is undoubted. On coins of Troezen the trident has the necessary barbs. But in Homer the trident is no fishing implement. It spears neither fishes nor foes: it raises a hurricane, it shakes the earth, it shivers the rocks, it makes the rivers to swell. It is the weapon of *Enosichthon*, who later takes shape as *Erechtheus*. The trident-mark in the *Erechtheion*,

open always to the sky, is no mark of a fishing spear, it is the sign of a thunder-smitten place, an *ἄβατον*, an *εὐηλύσιον*, a bidental; and a bidental, Dr. Blinkenberg might have added, is a sanctity more potent than that of a two-toothed lamb; it is the place of the coming of the twybladed thunderbolt. Thus, much has long been conjectured by Usener, Meyer, and others; it was reserved for Dr. Blinkenberg to clinch the argument by showing that the history of the Greek *triaina* is precisely duplicated by the Indian *trisula*, both derive from the zigzag of the lightning, not from the thunderbolt. The Hittite thunder-god's equipment alone is complete; he holds both bolt and zigzag, lightning, trident.

The book is admirably illustrated, and contains much new and elsewhere inaccessible material, *e.g.* in Fig. 2 an earth-temple from a remote mountain village in India showing the trident (*trisula*) erect among seven thunderstones. We note two omissions in the bibliography: P. Saint-Yoe's *Talismans et reliques tombés du ciel* in *Revue des Études Ethnographiques et Sociologiques*, 1909, p. 1, and an old but still valuable book, H. Martin's *La Foudre dans l'Antiquité*, 1866. All scholars, as well as ethnologists, will be grateful to Dr. Blinkenberg and to the Editors of the Cambridge Archaeological and Ethnological Series in which his delightful book appears.

JANE E. HARRISON.

Newnham College.

HORAZENS VERSMASSE, FÜR ANFÄNGER ERKLÄRT.

Horazens Versmasse, für Anfänger erklärt
von OTTO SCHRÖDER. Teubner, 1911.

A SMALL pamphlet of twenty-four pages might seem to call for very brief notice. But the writer is attempting to do a thing which would be very useful and important for all Classical teachers, if it were done successfully—to give a clear account of Horatian metres 'for beginners.' Dr. Schröder is an eminent writer on *Metrik*, and has published extensive investigations in the sphere of Greek lyrics. He is one of the metricians, *μεωτέροι* or *recentiores*, who

have revolutionised the study of *Metrik* in recent years. So this little book is a kind of challenge or pronouncement; it implies 'The results we have arrived at are so simple and certain that it is time to formulate them for the school-boy.' There is still a good deal of 'Zerfahrenheit' on the subject, he truly says in his Preface; people are 'at sixes and sevens'; and he proposes to furnish a 'Leitfaden' for the learner. It is doubtful whether the youthful Theseus for whom it is intended will be grateful for this thread. Instead of taking him safely through one labyrinth, it leads

him into another and more perplexing one.

It is not too sanguine to think that now, or before long, the thing could be done—that something fairly certain and satisfactory could be provided for the student of Horace. But Dr. Schröder has not done it. He tries to cover too much ground, and he includes too much that is disputable. His treatment of Horace's verse begins at p. 15 (in a pamphlet of twenty-four pages); in what precedes he deals with Greek metrical terminology and Greek metres. For the student of Horace there is too much of this; and for the student of Greek lyric poetry it is not enough. The exposition is brief to the verge of obscurity, or over the verge. The 'Stollengesetz' of course appears, the principle of construction which Dr. Schröder claims to have discovered in Greek lyric systems (p. 2); but this has by no means been universally accepted, and the Horatian student, when he comes to p. 15, learns that one of the conspicuous features of Horace's metrical equipment was 'Unbekanntheit mit dem Stollengesetz der griechischen Lyrik'! Horace knew nothing of it! For the metres of Horace a fairly simple terminology will in fact suffice. μέτρον, κῶλον, περίοδος, σύστημα—this vein of terminology is of little use. (Dr. Schröder uses the word κῶλον, speaking of κῶλα as 'δίμετρα, μονόμετρα, τρίμετρα,' etc., but without a word of explanation.) Four terms seem to be required by the 'beginner' for Horace: Foot (πούς, in a quite ordinary sense), line (στίχος), and stanza or στροφή—these three certainly, and a fourth, which should perhaps be 'phrase' or 'comma.' 'Comma' is Caesius Bassus' word; *integer vitae | scelerisque purus*, two *commata*. The most recent views about Horace's metres are really in pretty close agreement with Caesius Bassus; so much the better for them, for Caesius Bassus was a lyric poet and a writer on metre very near Horace's time.

The views of the νεώτεροι have undergone considerable modification since they were first propounded. Quadrisyllabic — Ionic-choriambic — scansion was carried too far and applied too

widely. We are no longer asked, as we were by Gleditsch (*Metrik* in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*), to follow Hephaestion without reserve and to contemplate an Alcaic stanza as divided thus: *Ἀσυνέτημι | τῶν ἀνέμων στάσις* | τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐν | θεῶν κύμα κυλ | ἰνδεται, | τὸ δ' ἐνθεῶν ἄμ | μες δ' ἂν τὸ μέσ | σον νῆι φορ | ἡμεθα σύν | μελαίνα. (This of course was never plausible for Horace, or propounded for him explicitly.) Nor, again, are we now called upon to divide 'Dactylo-Epitríte' verses thus: *Τυν- δαρίδαις | τε φιλόξεν | οἰς ἀδεῖν καλ | λιπλοκάμφ θ' | Ἑλένα*. Leo, Schröder himself, and Friedländer—the last especially, in an interesting and important article in *Hermes* (1909, Vol. 44, p. 321 f.)—have set limits to that. But Schröder still maintains—for beginners in Horace!—a quadrisyllabic opening for a Sapphic or Alcaic line; he brings into an elementary handbook the theory that in 'Aeolic' verses there is a survival of a primitive or perhaps Indo-European form of verse in which part was merely syllabic. The primitive form of verse was octosyllabic, and the last four syllables were the first to be regulated, becoming — — — or — — —, while the first four remained 'free.' Now this might perhaps be admitted to the extent of two syllables, the so-called 'Aeolic basis,' in which the syllables do seem to be 'free' in poets earlier than Horace. But Schröder gives us this scheme for a Sapphic line:

ο ο ο ο — — — —
φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν

and proceeds to give as a further example a line from so late a poet as Euripides, perhaps a different line altogether:

κρατήρων πλη—ρώματ' ἐφ' οἷσι πέμπει.

Maas (in the *Berliner Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1911, No. 23) has already taken exception to this; and he pertinently asked whether Sappho and Alcaeus would not rather resent it, if they were told that their lines were made up of two such heterogeneous elements as a syllabic or amorphous part, and a highly finished and regulated part (like Herodotus' mouse in Egypt—*pars imperfecta manebat*). In a hand-book this 'Indo-European' theory might be mentioned

in a footnote as an interesting speculation. The first four syllables of a Sapphic line, as Maas points out, are not 'free' but quite definitely regulated; the only freedom is that the fourth syllable may be either short or long. So too in an Alcaic 'Elfer' only the first syllable of the four is variable.

A final 'Leitfaden' for Horatian verse can hardly be produced till there is agreement about the Alcaic stanza, perhaps the most important of Horace's lyric metres and the metre in which he achieved his greatest success. Schröder's view of this seems to me entirely wrong. He gives as the scheme of the stanza *a a a b*. Now, this obviously suits a Sapphic stanza. It is arrived at for Alcaics by minimising the difference between the third line and the first two (p. 13): 'die vorletzte Senkung einkürzig, die letzte unausgeprägt' (i.e. omit *d* and *e* in *vulgus et arceo*, and the result is -|-|-). Thus a line that has not a single dactyl in it is classed as an 'Enoplischer Fünfheber'! In lecturing on Horace, I have for years set forth a quite different view. I stated it briefly in a lecture published in 1903; very briefly, because I thought it was more or less to be found in Wickham's Horace. But his statement, I find, is not satisfactory; he is obsessed by the notion that the first and second lines end each in two dactyls; and I think he means that the effect of the stanza depends partly on this, that two dactyls precede trochees or iambi in the fourth line, but follow them in the first and second. That is almost certainly not so. I was gratified to find that Friedländer had arrived at what I had taken to be the right view of the stanza. He expounds it, though in a slightly complicated way, in a footnote to the article in *Hermes* to which I have referred above (Vol. 44, p. 332). I will try to restate it in a simple form.

The effect of Horace's Alcaic stanza depends on two things: (a) a transition, at fixed points, from a trochaic or iambic movement to a movement which is dactylic or tries to be dactylic; (b) the repetition on a larger scale, in lines 3 and 4 of the movement seen in each of the two first lines. (a) *Odi profanum | vulgus et arceo*:

there is a *diaeresis*, a fresh start, an effect somewhat like that of an elegiac pentameter. By the regular pause after the fifth syllable Horace made the line a more complex thing than it had been with Alcaeus. (Friedländer quotes from tragedy some lines like: *μάκαιρ' Ἀγαύη | κληζόμεθ' ἐν θιάσοις*. --- --- may have been derived from --- ---.) The division is also rather like that of a Saturnian; it is easy to make an Alcaic out of that:—

dabunt Metelli | vincula Naevio.

Horace called the Saturnian a *horridus numerus* and associated it with the cane of Orbilius, but it does not follow that he would not think of it. (b) A dactyl intervenes, but in the first and second lines the change is not maintained—the trochee reasserts itself. The third line is a more resolute effort to stave off the invasion. The iambic or trochaic movement holds out twice as long; and then in the fourth line the dactyl rushes in in greater volume—this time there are two dactyls before the trochee reappears.

On this view, the symbols for an Alcaic stanza are not *a a a b*, but rather *ab ab A B*.

This notice is already too long. I must not discuss other metres; I merely point out that the *comma* --- --- belongs to Asclepiadean verses also, and that an Asclepiadean line may bethought of as *nullam severis arb- severis arb- severis arborem*, i.e. the completion of *severis arborem* is postponed by the interposition of a part of it, a dactyl and a syllable or a dactyl and a catalectic trochee (--- - ^). This is substantially Schröder's view; I agree here.

Another large question is raised by Schröder's pamphlet; what is the source of the changes which appear in Horace's verse as compared with that of Sappho and Alcaeus? Did Horace make them very deliberately, himself, on grounds of metrical theory? Maas, in the review mentioned above, is inclined to doubt this. But it is at least clear that Horace was a metrical theorist. Consider what he says about iambi in the A. P. *Tardior ut paullo graviorque veniret ad aures*, etc. So in lyrics he makes a syllable long where it

is possible (— — —, not — — —). Maas also doubts whether the evidence of Seneca's lyrics is of any importance for Horace. Here, too, I am inclined to dissent; the 'chunks' of Horatian lyric which Seneca transposes so freely are, I think, quite probably the very *commata* which Horace himself thought of. But space precludes further discussion of this matter.

One more point—a point of terminology, which might well be regulated by a Classical Association. How are the words 'arsis' and 'thesis' to be used? Schröder mentions the well-known fact that the Greeks thought of the dancer's foot or the conductor's wand, and meant by *thesis* the heavier, stronger, or more conspicuous part of a foot, and by *arsis* the lighter. The inversion of this, due to thinking of the voice, 'hat keine Aussicht auf ewige Dauer.' It seems reasonable and scientific to go back to the Greek usage. But what of *Hebung* and *Senkung* (for which 'Rise' and 'Fall' have been used in English by Prof. Sonnenschein and others)? What will be the 'beginner's' state of mind if a writer on *Metrik* calls an *arsis* a 'Senkung' when he happens to speak of it in German? Or are the words 'arsis' and 'thesis' to be discarded (the Greek use of them being perhaps mentioned,

as an interesting fact, in a footnote?) 'Hebung' and 'Rise' suit English and German verse better than they suit the strictly quantitative verse of the Greeks. But they are convenient terms, and in German at least easily manipulated (e.g. — — — — is an 'aeolischer Dreieheber'—'Aeolic tripod' are we to say in English, or 'Three-Rise Verse'?)

There are other disputable things in Schröder's book. There are also some acute definitions and useful remarks. But too often the 'beginner' will find it obscure. What notion of 'Porson's canon,' for example, can he derive from the brief statement: "Vor kretischem Schluss (—||—) keine *syllaba anceps*" lehrte Rich. Porson'? And what is said about Horace's non-observance of the rule is not much more lucid (p. 19). The implication that it is observed in Epode xvii. at once calls to mind *homicidam Hectorem*. Once or twice Schröder has Attic accentuation in an Aeolic text (λαβαν, θεοῖσι for λάβαν, θεοῖσι); probably a mere oversight, for on the opposite page two Attic accents are wrong also (κοῖνον and νεά in Sophocles). A book for beginners should be free from easily avoidable flaws.

W. R. HARDIE.

KÜHNER'S LATIN GRAMMAR.

Ausführliche Grammatik der latein. Sprache. Von R. KÜHNER. Second edition. Vol. I., neubearbeitet von F. HOLZWEISSIG. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. xvi + 1127. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1912. M. 24; bound, M. 26.

THE special merit of Kühner's work lay in the abundance of the examples given. In the new edition the character of the book remains unchanged; the general plan and even the numbering of the sections has been retained. The *Elementarlehre*, which treats of Sounds, Letters and Syllables, has been to a great extent rewritten, but the other parts of the book, and those probably the most useful parts, the chapters which deal with the In-

flexions and the Formation of Words, have not been thoroughly revised. Whole pages seem to have been left just as Kühner wrote them some forty years ago. (Even obvious mistakes have been retained: e.g. p. 576 *mihl, tihl* followed by correct statements as to the quantity. The references have apparently not been verified; e.g. p. 768 for *poturus* we are still referred to Lucr. 5, 712. Lucan is, no doubt, intended; p. 322 for Abl. Sing. of *collis* Lucr. 2, 522 and 37 are cited; *collis* does not occur in 37 but in 317). Yet in the meantime much progress has been made in the study of Latin. Texts have been greatly improved and the production of *Lexica*, *Indices Verborum*, and similar exact studies of the language of individual writers have made it possible to give

more systematic and more accurate information than Kühner could provide. As an example I would refer to Meusel's *Lexicon Caesarianum* and his articles on the text and language of Caesar. Dr. Holzweissig has not made full use of these advantages. Ennius, for instance, is still quoted by Vahlen's first edition (1854) instead of the second (1903), and the collections of examples are often far less full and representative than they could easily be made.

The object of the book, the Preface tells us, is to provide a detailed 'Repertorium' of the actual facts of Latin. There are two qualities that we look for in a 'Repertorium.' We expect to be able to find what we want easily, and we expect the information to be accurate and easy to interpret. In both respects this work is disappointing. Even when one has grown accustomed to the book, it takes longer than it should to find the information required. Some of the arrangements are bad: e.g. there is no reason why there should be separate alphabetical lists of Active and Deponent Verbs. The Index at the end is not full enough. In the text cross-references are often missing, and when given are by § instead of by page; as some §§ run to a great length, it often takes some time to find the right page. To take an example: if one wants information about the Gen. Pl. *deum*, one looks in the Index and sees '*deus* declined p. 456'; here one finds nearly a page about *deus*, but the Gen. Pl. is given as *deorum* and there is no mention of *deum*. One turns to the Table of Contents and finds under the Second Declension 'Remarks on the Case Endings'; one looks through the 25 pages of these Remarks and in time one arrives at Gen. Pl. in *-um* and finds a good deal of information about *deum*. (But the paragraph needs revision: what is the good of saying that *deum* is 'frequent in combination with a substantive'? Is that not true of all Genitives? Nor does one learn anything from the statement that a long list of phrases are 'all found partly in poetry and prose, or only in prose.') Of course, there should be a reference in the Index and a cross-reference from p. 456.

I pass to some instances of inaccurate

or misleading statements. Some are mere misprints, but such mistakes may cause much trouble: e.g. neither Bennet (p. vi) nor Bonnet (p. 11) would be a sufficient guide to the name C. E. Bennett in the catalogue of a large library. Some are more serious errors. In the paradigm of *nolo* we read 'Fut. (*nolam*, not used.)' It is probably true that *nolam* does not occur, but *noles* is found in Pl. *Epid.* 595, *nolet* in Cic. *Fam.* 6, 6, 9. The Pres. Inf. of *ēdo* is given in the alphabetical list as *edere* (only). On p. 808 it is given as *edere* and *esse*, and we are told that 'side by side with the regular forms there are non-thematic forms.' This leaves the impression that *edere*, e.g. was the earlier and more usual form and that the two sets of forms are to be found existing side by side. It should be stated definitely that the forms *es*, *est*, *essem*, etc., are the only forms used till quite late Latin.¹ There is a large collection of references to passages where these forms occur, but it lacks system. For instance for the 2nd Sing. Impv. the only reference is to *comes*, Pl. *Most.* 11; it would be reasonable to infer from this that the simple form *es* is never found and that *comes* does not occur after Plautus. But if Pl. *M. G.* 667 *es*, *bibe* and Ov. *a. a.* 3, 758 *es paulo quam potes esse minus* had been cited, one would see at a glance that *es* was on the lips of the Romans for generations. Some system in the selection of references would make the book twice as useful; as it is, one does not know whether the omission of an author means that he does not use the form; one often cannot tell when a form comes into use, nor in what kinds of writing it is found.

There is another defect to which I desire to call special attention, the absence of adequate references to the modern literature of the subject. There has been an immense amount of valuable work done in the thirty-five years since the first edition of this book was published. Indeed, a great authority² declares that, except Bücheler's book on

¹ See Dr. Postgate's interesting article "To Eat" and "To Drink" in Latin' (*Classical Review*, XVI. 110 ff.).

² F. Skutsch in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, I. viii.

the Latin Declension, works published before 1885 are no longer of value. A large reference book like this, which is intended for those who may want to go thoroughly into any of the topics, loses much of its value if it does not tell its readers where to seek further information. The reviser says in his Preface that to add such references as to details would be impossible. It would indeed be impossible to cite all the articles written on every difficult point, it would also not be very helpful. What is wanted, and it would not be very difficult to supply, is a selection of the best monographs on the more important topics. It is quite amusing to turn the pages and to see again and again the references, reprinted from the old edition, to Corssen and to various works with dates in the forties and even the thirties of the last century, but few references to the later works which have in most cases superseded them. If one wants, for instance,

to know more about the Gerundive and Gerund, one is referred to Weissenborn's treatise (1844), to Corssen's works (1863 and 1866), and to Neue. Contrast with this the list in Schalmz's *Syntax*, p. 449, which includes the valuable hint that one will find in a certain article by Lebreton ('Mém. de la Soc. de Linguistique,' xi. 145) 'a clear history of the attempts to explain the Gerund.'

It will be understood that the above remarks apply only to Vol. I. The second volume, the *Syntax*, is being revised by Dr. C. Stegmann, a writer who has proved by his articles in *Neue Jahrbücher* that he has a remarkable knowledge of the details of Latin *Syntax*. The first half of this volume has just been published (March, 1912), the second will, it is hoped, appear in 1913.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

*St. Paul's School, West Kensington,
London, W.*

ANCIENT ITALY; HISTORICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL INVESTIGATIONS IN CENTRAL ITALY, MAGNA GRAECIA, SICILY, AND SARDINIA.

Ancient Italy; Historical and Geographical Investigations in Central Italy, Magna Graecia, Sicily, and Sardinia. By ETTORE PAIS. Translated from the Italian by C. DENSMORE CURTIS. Crown 8vo. Pp. xiv + 441. 11 plates. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Cambridge: University Press, 1908. 10s. net.

THE essays collected in this volume possess a slender thread of connection in that they were all suggested by the author's researches in preparation for his *History of Magna Graecia and Sicily* and *History of Rome*. They vary considerably in length and importance. Some are brief contributions to archaeological periodicals, dealing with coins, inscriptions, or other monuments; others are detailed studies of literary tradition. The conclusions drawn have for the most part been incorporated in Pais' substantive works; but as the studies themselves doubtless reached a very limited circle of readers, it is con-

venient to have them included in a single volume. It is worthy of remark that Prof. Pais did not himself possess a copy of the essay on Strabo's *Historical Geography*, which was printed for private distribution, and was only able to obtain a single one from Prof. Beloch. Yet this essay is one of the most important in the volume!

The qualities and defects of Pais' work are well known to the world of scholars. His erudition is inexhaustible; but as a critic he is at once radical in his scepticism and dogmatic in his theorising. The essay on 'Siceliot elements in early Roman history' will furnish an example of this. It may readily be allowed that the early Roman annalists were greatly influenced by the Greek historical writings in which the traditions prevalent in the Western colonies were embodied; it is quite another thing to seek the origin of episodes in Roman history in similar stories current in the Greek cities. The narratives of the *secessiones plebis* in the

fifth century B.C. no doubt contain much unhistorical matter; and the story told of Telines of Gela by Herodotus has some points of resemblance with them. But to say that 'an accurate examination of the two narratives will show that we have to deal, not with two analogous events, but with a single legend,' passes the bounds of legitimate historical criticism. The resemblance between the fable of Menenius Agrippa and the use made of the *ipá* of the Chthonic divinities by Telines is slender indeed: the fact that Demeter = Ceres, and that this latter divinity was the protecting goddess of the *plebs*, carries us no further; and, as Pais himself points out, other secessions, such as that which led to the supremacy of Gelo in Syracuse, resemble in essential features that of the plebeians at Rome. This being so, there is surely no reason to conclude that 'the particulars of the account of the first secession were taken over from the Sicilian legend, which penetrated to Rome together with the cult of Ceres.'

The essay on Strabo confirms by a detailed examination of the evidence the view which has been gaining ground amongst scholars since Paul Meyer's treatment of the subject, that the geography was for the most part written in Strabo's middle life and only revised, with allusions to contemporary events, in the early years of Tiberius' reign. Pais insists strongly on the extreme rarity of historical notices alluding to events which took place between 6 B.C. and A.D. 14, and believes that the first draft of the work was completed by 7 B.C. It is not easy to see why it should have been laid aside for so many years before receiving the final touches, but the lacuna certainly exists. The detailed arguments adduced by Pais vary, however, considerably in force. He lays great stress on Strabo's assertion (7. 1. 4) that 'the Roman armies never crossed the Elbe,' which could not of course be said with literal truth after the expedition of Domitius Ahenobarbus (who did not, however, 'obtain a triumph,' but only the *ornamenta triumphalia*, cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4. 44). But the statement of Strabo, taken in its context, means no more than that

the Elbe was the limit of Roman influence and hence the regions beyond it were unexplored and could not be minutely described; and the chapter in which it occurs contains the well-known description of the triumph of Germanicus in A.D. 17, and was clearly written as a whole towards the close of Strabo's life. Again, Strabo does not say that 'Baton was leader of the Breuci and Daesitiatae,' but only of the latter tribe: it is, however, true that this statement must have been made before his internment at Ravenna in A.D. 9. The suggestion that Strabo had intimate relations with the dynasty founded by Polemon of Tralles is interesting, and is worked out by Pais in detail.

The editing of these Essays unfortunately leaves much to be desired. It would have been better to give the date and place of original publication in each case, and, as the Essay on Strabo was included, a paper on the life of the Geographer published by Pais in the *Rivista di Filologia* should certainly have also been translated. We are grateful for the illustrations, which are admirably reproduced; but why does the Editor say in a footnote on p. 174 that the well-known Etruscan column at Pompeii (shewn on Pl. V.) belonged to the Greek temple of which remains are still visible? Essay XIX. is headed 'The Cult of Athena *Siciliana*' (*sic*). This, of course, is merely modern Italian, not even Latin, like 'Argive Juno.' There are some strange errors in the translation of the concluding essay. 'Ptolemy' is twice written for 'Polemon' on p. 385; 'the deeds of the learned King Juba' (p. 415) seems to refer to his works, and it was of course Juba himself, not Strabo, who sent one of them to C. Caesar in 2 B.C. 'Octavia, the sister of Augustus, Marcellus, his son' (*sic*) is a blunder, the source of which is obvious: 'There are strange spellings such as 'Narbona,' 'Cabires' and the like (cf. *cardes* for *cardo*, p. 315). The Basilica Julia figures as the 'portico of Julius,' and the *porticus Vipsania*—named after Vipsania Polla, the sister of Agrippa—as the 'Portico of Vipsanius,' which is not the same thing. Needless to say, the editor has

not endeavoured to bring the Essays up to date by means of additional notes; no doubt this practice may be carried too far, but some reference to

Haeberlin's work on the Early Roman Coinage might well have been added on p. 317.

H. STUART JONES.

THE ARTICLES ON CLASSICAL SUBJECTS IN THE *ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA*.

The Articles on Classical Subjects in the 'Encyclopaedia Britannica.' Eleventh Edition. Cambridge University Press, 1911.

THERE are in the Eleventh Edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* some hundreds of articles on Classical subjects, covering some thousands of pages. More than four hundred of these articles dealing with Greece and Rome and the other peoples of the ancient world have been sent for review. It is obvious that any detailed criticism of so great a mass of material, so varied in interest, is impossible. At best the reviewer cannot do more than record certain general impressions, after a survey of the whole and a closer examination of particular articles. The task has not been rendered easier by the form in which the articles have been submitted. They are on loose pages, some on thick paper, others on thin, some are proof-sheets with corrections marked on them, in some the pages are not consecutive. Many articles on Classical subjects have not been sent, others are incomplete.

The eleventh edition incorporates some matter from the tenth edition and some from the ninth. No indications are given of the date at which the articles were originally written, and the work offers a problem of stratification almost Homeric in its difficulty. Some articles published over thirty years ago are reprinted, some with modifications by later hands. It would be out of date to review to-day the work of Mark Pattison and Professor Sellar, of Sir Richard Jebb and Professor Lewis Campbell.

The variety of topics is great and includes the history of Scholarship and the biographies of Scholars, the geography, topography, and ethnology of the ancient world, the history and

antiquities, the religion, the art and archaeology, and the literature of the Greeks and Romans. It is probably impossible in an *Encyclopaedia* of this character to co-ordinate the work of different authors, to prevent overlapping or contradiction. When the subjects have once been assigned, the authors must be left to go their own way, with cross references as sign-posts or danger-signals. It is inevitable, for instance, that there should be repetition and variety of opinion on such a subject as the Homeric problem, which is treated from different points of view by Sir Richard Jebb, Dr. Monro, Dr. Giles, and Professor Myres. A most effective contrast is afforded by the choice of Professor Ridgeway as the author of the article 'Achaeans' and of Professor Myres as the author of the article 'Pelasgians.' Each writer states his view of the common problem, and refers politely to the other 'for another view than that here taken.'

To some extent uniformity has been secured by making one writer responsible for a number of articles on allied subjects. Thus Professor Ernest Gardner writes on Greek, Mr. Hogarth on Asiatic, and Mr. Ashby on Italian topography. Mr. E. R. Bevan is responsible for Macedonian and Hellenistic history. Professor Edward Meyer contributes much that is valuable on Persian and Oriental History. Dr. Giles writes on problems of philology and Professor Conway on the languages of Italy.

Some typical articles in different departments may be briefly considered. Sir John Sandys (who writes also some literary articles, as well as an account of Greek Law) in the article 'Classics' gives, besides a summary history of Scholarship, a survey of 'The Study of Classics in Secondary Education.'

In this he brings out many points of interest, such as Shakespeare's allusions to Classical teaching, the influence of the Jesuits in depreciating the subject-matter of the Classics and the recent history of Classical Study in France and Germany. In history Sir Arthur Evans gives a clear statement of results in his account of Crete, while Mr. Hogarth discusses Aegean civilisation. Mr. E. M. Walker (who writes also on 'Aegina,' 'Athenian Constitution,' and 'Theopompus') contributes an admirable article on Greek History. His main purpose is to indicate problems and to discuss points of view and authorities. He shows much analytic and critical power and a judicious estimate of sources. Professor Conway and Mr. Stuart Jones write on Roman History, basing their narrative on the excellent survey which Professor Pelham wrote for the ninth edition. Religion is not treated with the same fulness as other branches of study. Dr. Farnell and Mr. Bailey write lucidly of Greek and Roman Religion, but their accounts are too brief to deal adequately with the problems, and the articles on the separate deities and cults are in great part too slight to compensate. Many of the articles on literature are taken, with more or less modification, from the

ninth edition. Sir Richard Jebb's compendious sketch of Greek Literature has had brief allusions to recent discoveries added, but even so it seems rather antiquated. His article on 'Pindar' is left unaltered save for a reference in the footnotes to the new poems in the papyri. Professor Postgate and others have revised the work of Professor Sellar, which has an impression of greater freshness. Mr. A. C. Clark in a short space discusses with admirable judgment the life and works and style of Cicero and gives a useful account of the manuscripts and a history of the criticism of the author.

The impression left by a survey of the articles is that, while there is much that is valuable, there is much that is ordinary and commonplace. The scholar will, in most of the articles he consults, desire fuller references than he will find in most of them. The uninstructed reader will find some excellent articles, which present the results of research in a clear and interesting form, and a multitudinous host of short articles which give the familiar facts compressed into that form of intellectual pemmican usual in dictionaries of universal scope.

L. W.

VERSION

A SHROPSHIRE LAD.

BE still, my soul, be still; the arms you
bear are brittle,
Earth and high heaven are fixt of
old and founded strong.
Think, rather—call to thought, if now
you grieve a little,
The days when we had rest, O soul,
for they were long.

Men loved unkindness then, but light-
less in the quarry
I slept and saw not; tears fell down,
I did not mourn;
Sweat ran, and blood sprang out, and
I was never sorry;
Then it was well with me, in days
ere I was born.

TA MIKPA MTΣTHPIA.

εὐφήμει, φίλε θυμέ· φέρεις εὐθραυστά τοι
ὄπλα·
ἡ πάλαι ἐστήρικτ' οὐρανός, αἶα πάλαι.
μὴ στένε δὴν· φρόντιζε μὲν οὖν ὅσο'
ἤματα μακρὰ
ξυνὴν ἡγάγομεν, θυμέ, δι' ἡσυχίην·

βῶλος ἐγὼ τότε' ἀμαυρὸς ἑών, οὐ θνητὰ
διδῶμαι
δάκρυ', ἀνάληγτον δ' ἀγριότης μ'
ἔλαθεν·
αἶμ',—ἐμοῦ οὐδ' ἔψαν,—ἀνεκῆκιε καὶ
ῥέεν ἰδρῶς
ἄσπετος, ἀλλ' ἔτ' ἔην ὄλβιος, οὐ γὰρ
ἔφυν.

Now, and I muse for why, and never
find the reason,

I pace the earth, and drink the air,
and feel the sun.

Be still, be still, my soul—it is but for
a season;

Let us endure an hour and see in-
justice done.

Ay, look! high heaven and earth ail
from the prime foundation;

All thoughts to rive the heart are
here, and all are vain:

Horror and scorn and hate and fear
and indignation—

Oh, why did I awake? when shall I
sleep again?

A. E. HOUSMAN.

νῦν τί παθὼν γ' (οὐπω διζήμενος ἐξεύ-
ρηκα)

γαῖάν τ' ἡελίον τ' ἀέρα τ' αἰσθά-
νομαι;

τέτλαθι μοι, κραδίη, πῆχυνον ἐπὶ χρόνον
ἔμψης

ὀρβοῖσιν τ' ἀτένιζ' ὄμμασιν εἰς ἄδικα·

πυθμένος ἐκ νεάτου πονέει γαῖ' αἰπύ θ'
ἔδος θεῶν,

καὶ τρύχει με φρένας δήνεα πάντα
μάτην,

φρίκη καὶ νέμεσις τε φόβος τε χόλος τε
καὶ ἔχθρη·

ἀγρυπνέω γι'; πότε' αὖ κείσομαι ὥστε
λίθος;

HUGO JOHNSON.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I have to thank Mr. Prickard for pointing out my error in attributing the reading 'Tum bibes' (Horace, *Od.*, i. 20. 10.) to Wickham. Let me add that you yourself drew my attention to it, and I was under the impression that I had corrected it in the proofs. Such had certainly been my intention. The error was due to a faulty arrangement of the data, and is one that I sincerely regret.

Mr. Prickard's exposition of the figure of speech employed amounts, it seems to me, to a demonstration. The mention of Formian wine (*III.* 16. 34.), as among the possessions of a favoured class leaves my suggestion with little to rest on; for though it might have been a much worse wine than the others, it was evidently not a poor one.

With regard to the Falernian, though it was undoubtedly a good wine, it does not follow that it was not ranked lower than Caecuban and Falernian. Moreover, its strength, and consequent unsuitability for a convalescent, is to be gathered from such passages as *Od.* i. 27. 10; *Od.* ii. 11. 9; *Sat.* i. 10. 24; *Epp.* i. 14. 34; *Sat.* ii. 2. 16.

The fact that the ode is not an invitation scarcely invalidates, I think, my conjecture. In any case Maecenas was being prepared for a humble reception.

On the whole, however, I must regard the interrogative form as inadvisable. If my conjecture were correct the Formian wine must have been quite a poor one, and could hardly have been placed by Horace among envied possessions. On Mr. Prickard's interpretation the ode seems to me to have point enough.

L. H. ALLEN.

Sydney Teachers' College,
March 19, 1912.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I shall be obliged if you can find room for the following suggestion:

In Catullus XXIX. for the pointless *malum* of l. 21 read *Lamum*:

Quid hunc Lamum fovetis? aut quid hic potest
Nisi uncta devorare patrimonium?

Formiae, the 'Mamurrarum urbs' of Horace (*S.* i. 5. 37), is called by Ovid (*Metam.* XIV. 233) 'Urbs Lami,' from its founder Lamus (*Odys.* X. 81. *Hor.*, C. iii. 17). Catullus suggests a comparison between two degenerates, a 'Romulus' turned 'cinaedus' and a 'Lamus' become 'decoctor.' Note that this correction seems to tell, and to tell decisively, in favour of something like Lachmann's¹ restoration of that *locus conclamatus*, l. 23,

Eone nomine, urbis o piissime
Socer generque, perdidistis omnia?

For in Homer (*loc. cit.*) Lamus' people are *cannibals* and, with this 'learned' allusion added, the irony of 'piissime' becomes more pointed than ever²: 'Pietas incarnate ruining everything for the sake of—a cannibal!' The form 'piissimus' is of course doubtful; and so the scribe of V or V's exemplar found it. That

¹ Haupt preferred 'orbis o piissimei.' Recently M. Saenger in a Russian periodical, while himself proposing 'includissime,' cites from Th. Korsch 'urbis o piissimei.' Some such modification of Lachmann's conjecture may seem desirable.

² The words 'Mamurram,' 'vorax' (bis), 'comesset,' 'elluatus' all prepare us for the hit in Lamum:—'devorare' drives the point home. Cf. also Ovid's 'Laestrygonis impia tinxit ora cruore suo' (*Metam.* XIV. 237). On these 'Neptuni filii' see Aul. Gellius, xv. 21.

is why, regardless of metre, he indicated between the lines the alternative form of the superlative (*pienissimus*), thus—

ul' ent
Eone nomine urbis opijissime, etc.

No wonder this was misunderstood. The dot was thought to mean that the first 'i' should be struck out and replaced by the letters between the lines.¹ Hence the mysterious *opulentissime* of V.

But Professor Ellis obelises the word 'urbis' also, and I would go further and propose

Eone *eone* nomine, o piissimi
Socer genereque, perdidistis omnia?

Line 23 repeats line 11—but with a difference. There C is addressing Caesar alone, here he

¹ This ul' (=vel) has undoubtedly got into the text of O at XCV. 10, and XXII. 15, and is probably accountable for the monstrous 'guioclero' (= 'guro ul' ero,' i.e. 'guro vel goero') at LXVI. 6. See Bährens' Commentary, ad loc.

includes Pompeius—'Ex uno duo'.² Hence the doubled 'eone.' If this appears to be too subtle, it cannot be denied that the rhetorical repetition exactly suits the impassioned appeal. Cf. the last line of Horace's fourth Epode, '... Hoc hoc tribuno militum'; Virgil, *Aen.* IX. 427, 'Me me, adsum qui feci,' etc.; and Cic. *Phil.* II. 18, 43, 'Audite, audite, P.C.,' etc., which shrinks to Audite, P.C. (Mr. Clark *ad loc.*) in the MSS. of Suetonius who quotes the passage (*de Rhetor.* 5); just as the 'eone eone' shrank to 'eone' here. But here the corrector's note between the lines, 'ū bis' (= 'uerbum bis scribendum') was unfortunately mistaken for the more familiar 'urbis' and so introduced into the text by the scribe of the 'corruptissimum exemplar,' from which not only G but seemingly all other MSS. of Catullus are derived.

D. A. SLATER.

Cardiff.

² Professor Ellis on a kindred device in Catullus LXIV. See *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, p. 260 sq. Cf. also line 3 of the Virgilian parody of this poem (*Catal.* VI.)—'Tuone nunc puella talis et tuo,' which surely suggests a similar 'iteration' in the original.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

. *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Atlas of Ancient History. Thirty-three maps and plans, with notes and index. London: W. and A. K. Johnston, Ltd. Paper boards, 2s. net.

Blümner (H.) Technologie und Terminologie. Der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern. Erster Band. Illustrated. 9" x 6". Pp. xii + 364. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 14.

Brooks (F.) An Athenian Critic of Athenian Democracy. Being a translation of the De Republica Atheniensium. 7" x 5". Pp. 28. London: D. Nutt, 1912. Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Cug (E.) Le Sénatus-Consulte de Délos de l'An 166 avant notre Ère. 11½" x 9". Pp. 25. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1912. Fr. 1.70.

Dreuer (J.) Greek Education. 7½" x 5". Pp. vi + 108. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 2s. net.

Geikie (Sir A.) The Love of Nature among the Romans. 9" x 5½". Pp. xii + 394. London: John Murray, 1912. Cloth, 9s. net.

Gnesotto (A.) Il Codice Crespanese del De Officiis di Cicerone, pp. 16, and Il Testo del De Officiis di Cicerone; Nel Codice di Troyes 552, pp. 6. Padua: G. B. Randi, 1912.

Hamilton (M. A.) Greek Legends. 7½" x 5". Pp. 192. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

Haverfield (F.) The Study of Ancient History in Oxford. 9" x 6". Pp. 32. Oxford: University Press, 1912. 1s. net.

— *The Romanisation of Roman Britain. New edition, revised and enlarged. 9" x 6". Pp. 70. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Paper boards, 3s. 6d. net.*

Homeri Opera. Vol. V. Edited by T. W. Allen (Oxford Text). 7½" x 5". Pp. xii + 281. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

Horace. Odes and Carmen Saeculare, translated into English Verse by W. S. Morris. 7" x 4½". Pp. xii + 116. Oxford: Henry Frowde, 1912. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

Ὁρατίου Φράσις, εἰς ἑνὲς ποικιλλόντας ἀπὸ δύο ἔως ὑπερτριάκοντα· μετὰ Εἰσαγωγῆς καὶ Σημειώσεων. 10" x 7". Pp. 46. London: Parnassus Press, 1912. 2s. 6d.

Karsten (H. T.) Commenti Donatiani ad Terentii Fabulas Scholia Genuina et Spuria. Vol. I. 9½" x 6½". Pp. xxiv + 281. Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1912. M. 4.

Leendertz (P.) Floris ende Blancefloer van Diederick van Assenede. 9½" x 6½". Pp. cxxv + 141. Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1912. M. 8.

Lesquier (J.) Les Institutions Militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides. 10" x 6½". Pp. xviii + 384. Paris: E. Le Roux, 1912. Fr. 15.

- Lieben* (E.) *Zur Biographie Martialis*. II Teil. 10" x 6½". Pp. 16. Prague: Rohlicek und Sievers, 1912.
- Livy*. Book I. By W. J. Edwards. 7" x 5". Pp. lvii + 232. With map. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Ovid* (Selections) By W. D. Lowe. Oxford Elementary Latin Readers (Illustrated). 6½" x 4¾". Pp. 96. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Papyrus Grecs* (de Lille) Tome II., Fasc. II., III., and IV. Publiés sous la direction de Pierre Jouguet. 11½" x 9". Pp. 220. With facsimiles. Paris: E. Le Roux, 1912. Fr. 25.
- Responsions Papers* in Stated Subjects, exclusive of Books. 1906-1911. With Answers to Mathematical Questions and an Introduction. By C. A. Marcon and F. G. Brabant. 7½" x 5". Pp. 160. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Paper boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Sohn* (R.) *Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus*. 9" x 5¾". Pp. xxxiv + 68. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 2.40.
- Sonnenschein* (E. A.) *A New Latin Grammar*. 7½" x 5". Pp. 266. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Stemplinger* (E.) *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*. 9" x 6". Pp. vi + 293. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 10.
- Strachan Davidson* (J. L.) *Problems of the Roman Criminal Law*. In 2 vols. 9" x 6¾". Pp. xxii + 245 and 288. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Teubner's Texts*. Apolinarii Metaphrasis Psalmorum (A. Ludwich), pp. xl + 308, M. 6. Sancti Diadochi Episcopi Photicensis de Perfectione Spirituali Capita Centum (J. E. Weis-Liebersdorf), pp. vi + 166, M. 3.20. Vitae Vergilianae (J. Brunner), pp. xxiv + 74, M. 2. 6¾" x 4½". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912.
- Thallusa*. *Carmen praemio aureo ornatum in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano*. Accedunt novem carmina laudata. 10" x 6½". Amsterdam: J. Muller, 1912.
- Ussani* (V.) *Carmen valde laudatum*. 13" x 8½". Pp. 8. Roma: Tip. Editrice Nazionale, 1912.
- Vollmer* (F.) *Epitome Thesauri Latini*. Vol. I., Fasc. 1, a -aedilis. 9" x 12¼". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 2.
- Winbolt* (S. E.) *Vergil's Taking of Troy* (Simplified Text). 6½" x 4¾". Pp. viii + 86. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1912. 1s. 6d.
- Zielinski* (T.) *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*. 9" x 6". Pp. viii + 371. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 6.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. Members receive a copy of the annual 'Proceedings' of the Association and of the Year's Work in Classical Studies (both post free). They may also obtain the CLASSICAL REVIEW and CLASSICAL QUARTERLY at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free).

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Mr. J. H. Sleeman, The University, Sheffield, and Mr. M. O. B. Caspari, University College, London; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss M. S. Lilley, Girls' High School, Manchester; Mr. R. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. K. Forbes, 135, Chatham Street, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 5, Park Avenue, Mapperley Road, Nottingham; and the Rev. Father Ailingier, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.